

STATEMENT re. VIOLATIONS OF THE
CEASE-FIRE LINE BY PAKISTAN IN
JAMMU AND KASHMIR

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI A. M. THOMAS): Sir, on behalf of Shri Y. B. Chavan, Minister of Defence, I beg to lay on the Table of the House a Statement regarding violations of the Cease-fire Line by Pakistan in Jammu and Kashmir. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3334/64].

NOMINATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under sub-rule (1) of rule 205 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I hereby nominate the following Members to the Committee on Subordinate Legislation:—

1. Shri P. N. Saprú.
2. Shri R. S. Doogar.
3. Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.
4. Shri N. Ramakrishna Iyer.
5. Shri Akbar Ali Khan.
6. Shri S. N. Mishra.
7. Shrimati Nandini Satpathy.
8. Shri M. N. Govindan Nair.
9. Shri G. S. Pathak.
10. Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.
11. Shri M. Ruthnaswamy.
12. Shri D. L. Sen Gupta.
13. Shri M. C. Shah.
14. Shri B. K. P. Sinha.
15. Shri G. D. Tapase.

Under sub-rule (1) of rule 206 of the said Rules I appoint Shri P. N. Saprú to be the Chairman of the Committee.

CONSTITUTION OF A GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hereby constitute a General Purposes Committee consisting of the following Members:—

1. Shrimati Violet Alva.
2. Shri M. C. Chagla.
3. Shri Anand Chand.
4. Shrimati Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy.
5. Shri M. P. Bhargava.
6. Shri R. S. Doogar.
7. Shri D. P. Karmarkar.
8. Shri Akbar Ali Khan.
9. Prof. M. B. Lal.
10. Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.
11. Shri P. Ramamurti.
12. Shri Ramprasanna Ray.
13. Shri P. N. Saprú.
14. Shrimati Tara Ramchandra Sathe.
15. Shri A. B. Vajpayee.
16. Col. B. H. Zaidi.

I appoint Shrimati Violet Alva to be the Chairman of the Committee.

RESOLUTION RE PROCLAMATION
ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT IN
RELATION TO THE STATE OF
KERALA

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 10th September, 1964, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Kerala."

In moving this Resolution for the approval of this House, Sir, I may, at the outset, narrate very briefly the

circumstances which led to the issue of the Proclamation by the President.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal). Nemesi.

SHRI JALSUKHLAL HATHI: On 2nd September, 1964, two members of the Congress Legislature Party, Shri K. M. George and Shri Balakrishna Pillai, presented to the Governor a memorandum signed by fifteen members of the Congress Legislature Party stating that they had lost confidence in the leadership of Shri R. Sankar, Chief Minister, and that they had withdrawn their support to the Ministry. They further said that they wanted to function thereafter separately in the Legislature. At the same time, they also informed the Speaker to the same effect and asked for a separate block for them. The Congress Party in the Assembly at that time consisted of sixty-five members, excluding the Speaker and when fifteen of them defected from the Party, its membership was reduced to fifty from sixty-five. The total strength of the Assembly of the State was one hundred and twenty-seven, including the Speaker. I should also like to mention the composition of the Party membership as existing then.

Congress—65 (Out of this 15 had become dissidents and so the number became 50).

Dissident Congressmen—15.

Communist (Right Wing)—19.

Communist (Left Wing)—9.

Samyukta Socialist Party—15.

Muslim League—11.

Independents—5.

R.S.P.—1.

One seat was vacant consequent on the death of Shri Chacko, and the other seat was held by the Speaker. Thus, the total strength of the Legislature at that time was one hundred and twenty-seven out of which originally sixty-five were Congressmen. After these fifteen dissidents defected from the Congress Party, the strength

was reduced to fifty. On September 3, 1964, when the Legislative Assembly met, Shri P. K. Kunju Pillai, Leader of the Samyukta Socialist Party, moved a Motion of No Confidence against the Ministry in the State. This was allowed and the Speaker asked the members to stand up in their seats. The fifteen dissident Congressmen stood up in support of the Motion. The Speaker, therefore, fixed the 7th and the 8th September, 1964, for discussion of the Motion. The motion was discussed on these two days and then it was put to vote when it obtained the support of seventy-three Members while fifty voted against it. Two Independents were absent. This information that the Motion of No Confidence had been voted upon and carried was conveyed to the Governor by the Speaker the same day. The Chief Minister also tendered the resignation of the Council of Ministers to the Governor the same evening but he was asked to continue in office till alternative arrangements were made for the conduct of the government. Immediately afterwards, the Governor sent for the various leaders of the different Parties in the Legislature. He called Shri P. K. Kunju Pillai, Leader of the Samyukta Socialist Party. He also called Shri Ahmaḍ Kuraikal, Leader of the Muslim League, Shri K. M. George, Leader of the Dissident Congressmen, Shri C. Achutha Menon, Leader of the Right Wing Communist Party and Shri E. M. S. Namboodripad, Leader of the Left Wing Communist Party but Shri Namboodripad was out of station and so he could not meet the Governor. The Governor met all the others separately with a view to ascertaining whether an alternative Government could be formed by them either singly or jointly with anybody else. Shri P. K. Kunju, Shri Ahmaḍ Kuraikal and Shri K. G. George told the Governor in very clear and unequivocal terms that they would not be in a position to form a Ministry either singly or as a united Legislature Party under a single Leader. Shri Achutha Menon felt

[Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi.]

that if the S.S.P. had joined him, he would have made an attempt to form a Government but in view of the stand taken by the S.S.P. Leader, there was no question of his pressing to form a separate Government. Having studied the entire situation and having come to the conclusion that no single Leader or Party or a United Legislature Party under a single Leader could form a government, the Governor had no alternative but to report to the President about the political breakdown in the State of Kerala and suggest the issue of a Presidential Order under article 356 of the Constitution. It is in these circumstances that the President had to issue this Proclamation. A copy of the Proclamation had been placed on the Table of the House. As will be seen, under this Proclamation,

"The President has been satisfied that a situation had arisen under which the Government of the State of Kerala cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of India."

He has, therefore, assumed to himself, as President of India, all functions of the Government of the said State and all the powers vested in or exercisable by the Government of the State. Under the provisions of the Constitution, this Proclamation has to be approved by both the Houses of Parliament within two months of issue. It is, therefore, Sir, that I have come before this House to get its approval. It is no pleasure for me or for the Government to come with this Resolution and seek the approval of the House for a Proclamation which has had to be issued by the President.

The circumstances in which the Proclamation had been issued or had to be issued have been narrated. It is really unfortunate that such a situation should have arisen. Kerala has been having a chequered political career from 1957 onwards. It was in 1957 that the Communist Government came in. Fortunately or unfor-

tunately that Government could not carry on for a long time. I would not like to go into the details of the past because I do not want unnecessarily to rake up any controversial points here. Therefore I would not deal with the past history. But one thing is certain that there have been in the State difficulties, difference of opinions, caste, religion and various other factors which have led to this sort of condition and I would only hope that the people of Kerala would try to have a stable Government under a party which could function as a stable Government and work unitedly for the progress, for the development and for the prosperity of the people not of Kerala alone but of the country as a whole. I would not like to go in detail, as I said earlier, into either the recent past from 1960 to 1964 or the earlier past between 1950 and 1960 because I do not want unnecessarily to rake up the controversies. My purpose is very limited so far as this Resolution is concerned. The Resolution seeks the approval of the House for the Proclamation issued by the President. That was inevitable. As there was a breakdown, as it was not possible that the Government of the State could be carried on according to the provisions of the Constitution the Governor reported accordingly and when the Governor was satisfied that it was impossible to carry on the Government of the State according to the provisions of the Constitution there was no other way but to act under article 356 of the Constitution. I therefore commend this Resolution for the approval of the House.

The question was proposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon any hon. Member to speak, I would like to say that the Business Advisory Committee has allotted one day for the discussion of this Resolution and for the Kerala State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill. There are a number of speakers whose:

names are already before me. We would therefore have to sit through lunch and I would request Members to be brief. I would be very happy if they confine their speeches to fifteen minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want to ask a question, a clarification. The hon. Minister said that even before the Assembly was convened on the 3rd September the Governor did have information that so many Members had left the Congress Party thereby making it a party which did not have a majority. Then on the 3rd September when the Assembly met and when the no confidence motion was moved Members demonstrably stood up to make it clear that the Congress Ministry had the support of only 50 Members or so. Anyhow it had only a minority behind it compared to the total strength of the House. I should like to know what the Governor was doing between the time he received the information from the legislature that the Congress Government did not have a majority and the time when this no confidence motion was moved which again confirmed that the Congress did not have a majority? Why was the Ministry allowed to continue till the 7th or 8th? Constitutionally, was it not right for the Ministry to resign in the first instance on the 3rd when so many people had stood up in favour of the no confidence motion? Those who stood up in support of the motion were having a majority of 20 or so. I should like to have a proper explanation. In the statement that has been given by the Governor there is no explanation to the unprecedented manner in which the constitutional authority there behaved.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: As very often happens even with my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, very often after the debate, after hearing the arguments for and against, the Members may change their mind. Also standing up in their seats was only a preliminary action to decide

whether the motion should be admitted or not. Once the motion is admitted, there has to be a debate and ultimately the motion has either to be carried or lost as it happened once earlier and the Government continued.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The point is not that. Under our constitutional practice, it is the prerogative of the Governor to advise the proper authority—here it is the President—or act *suo motu* the moment he is convinced or he has got sufficient objective evidence that the Government does not have a majority. The no confidence motion is not a mere motion. Here it was made known to the Governor before the Assembly met that these people were not going to support the Government and on the 3rd for the motion 'that this House expresses want of confidence in the Council of Ministers' so many people even from the Congress Party stood up and I think over 70 members stood up. At that time the matter was clinched absolutely and there was no other evidence required. Why at that very moment did not Mr. Sankar offer his resignation? Can the hon. Minister cite any example of history where there is a parliamentary system—particularly from Britain—when in a comparable situation or in a situation much less demonstrative, the Ministry or the Government stuck to office?

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: As the hon. Member himself said the Governor should be convinced. The fact that the Members rose in their seats or gave a memorandum is primarily a *prima facie* case but the question of conviction comes only after it has been voted upon. I should like to ask from the hon. Member whether anywhere where democracy and parliament function, when a motion of no confidence is just admitted, it could be said that the party has lost the confidence of the majority.

(Interruptions.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no Mr. Govindan Nair.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Chairman, Sir, once again in our State the Constitution stands suspended and the President's Rule is proclaimed. The hon. Minister has clearly placed before this House the circumstances in which the President's Rule had to be proclaimed.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

My hon. leader raised a very inconvenient question.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: It was very convenient for me.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: It was a very inconvenient question.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: For you.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Not for me but for the Minister and his party. On September 3rd when 71 members stood up in support of the no confidence motion it was clear that the Congress Ministry was lost.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): Was it in support of the no confidence motion or was it in support of the motion being admitted?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has hardly begun. Please listen to him with a little patience.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: When that news reached Delhi one of the veteran leaders of the Congress, Shri S. K. Patil, was rushed to Kerala to see whether any rapprochement was possible with the dissident Congressmen. The leaders of the dissident Congressmen, as you know, are the communal leaders of our State. He met Mr. Mannath Padmanabhan and requested him to save the Congress Ministry. He sent a frantic call to the Muslim League leader . . .

SHRI M. R U T H N A S W A M Y (Madras): Secret history.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR:

. . . Shri Bafaki Thangal, to reach Trivandrum immediately and to get him out of the situation. Unfortunately, none of them conceded and so this fall. It was to manoeuvre, to see whether they could somehow work up a majority, they wanted these few days. That is why I said when things had happened like this, it would not be proper for the Minister to come forward and say: Because we wanted to try this we had to allow the Ministry to continue till the 7th or 10th.

Now, this is not the first time that we are having President's Rule. This is the third time we are having it. Even this statement will not convey correctly the depth of the political instability and crisis that is facing our State. During the last eighteen years after independence, we had ten Ministries and for the third time we are having President's Rule. So, the average age of a Ministry is near about sixteen months. Now, very many fantastic theories are being put forward for this sorry state of affairs in our State. The other day, when this was discussed in the other House, some hon. Members blamed the Constitution. Some others said this: In Kerala since the people have a high level of education, since they have a high level of political consciousness, this kind of political instability is inevitable. All these are false and fantastic theories, which should not be accepted. Any change of the Constitution, however welcome it may be otherwise, will not solve the problem in Kerala. So, also, you will be only defaming democracy if you say that if in a State the people have a high level of education or a high level of political consciousness, no stable Government can work there. So, you have to go to the root of the matter. Now, the hon. Minister said that he would not like to go to the root of the matter or go into the past since it may arouse controversies. Now, in the interests of all those who want to see that democracy and secularism

thrive in the country—whether it is controversial or otherwise—you have to go deep into the matter and unless you do it, you will not be able to solve the problem that is facing Kerala.

Now, Madam, you will permit me, if I take a little more time, since I have to go into the past not in detail, but at least to indicate the developments in our State since independence. Now, according to me the basic mistake is the encouragement that obscurantist communal forces and undemocratic forces in our country received at the hands of the ruling party during these years. That is responsible for the continuous crisis in our State. Now, Shri Kamaraj, the President of the Congress, who has been touring our State recently, in all his speeches, was telling and appealing to the people that they should vote for the Congress, if they wanted a stable Government. Now, in 1946, when we had the first election, in an Assembly of 108, there were 107 Congress members. There was only one member in the Opposition. (*Interruption.*) Still within six months the first Ministry fell. There were three Ministries from 1946 to 1952. Did the Congress seriously try to find out what was at the root of the matter? At that time it was the Travancore State. Responsible Government was granted. The Congress leadership invited the communal leaders and the nominees of their choice were put up as candidates for the Assembly. So, within a few months, communal wranglings started. The recent Chief Minister, Shri Sankar, and Shri Mannath Padmanabhan walked out of the Congress, started a tirade against the Congress and paraded in the whole State saying that the Congress should be finished. Even after that experience, when in 1952 the elections were approaching, these very same people were taken back into the Congress. They went after them. They wooed them and finally got them into the Congress. During the period from 1952 to 1957 we had

four Ministries and President's Rule for a year. That was the position. In 1957 after the elections when the communists got a majority, their surrender to the communal forces was complete, was absolute. I also do not want to go into what happened during that period, because when the Congress found that they could not politically fight us and defeat us, they encouraged the communal forces. They unleashed the communal and caste forces in our State, and when they were given full encouragement to do whatever they liked, they not only blessed them but even the Congress flag was handed over to them. You know about the so-called liberation struggle. Who headed the struggle? It was Shri Mannath Padmanabhan. Which were the driving forces behind it? It was the Catholic Church, and still it was the Congress that conducted the struggle. And who was the main architect? Shri Dhebar. Some Members in the other House questioned why he was allowed to go to Kerala. (*Interruption.*) You may support him on that line. I say he is the man who must go now because the wind he has sown he has got to reap now. He reaped it and he had to flee away from there. And what happened to Kamaraj? He was insulted, he was humiliated. By whom? By the very forces you nourished and encouraged. One day he was not even allowed to take his food. I do not want to go into all those things that happened. But I am just pointing out what damage it has done, this constant encouragement of the communal and caste forces in our State, what damage that has done to the State as well as to your own party. Think about this thing seriously, and unless you understand this, unless you understand your basic mistake in encouraging these forces, you will not be able to save the State from political instability.

Madam, we know that even the best among the Congressmen feel that when we have accepted a democratic constitution which guarantees fundamental rights and adult franchise,

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair]

democracy is safe in our country. I am not minimising the impact of our Constitution on our national life. But you would remember that we have inherited a society, a social structure which is highly hierachical, which means that it negates equality of citizenship. Every one knows that the essence of democracy is equality of man, and if a social structure which denies that is allowed to continue, if it is allowed to grow and establish itself and dominate over the political life of the country, where can democracy exist? So, unless you take note of this factor and fight against it, try to demolish the whole structure we have inherited and rebuild the society on a healthy basis, you will not be able to have democracy functioning properly in our country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken fifteen minutes but you can go on.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Thank you very much. Now, Madam, this should be a lesson not only to the Congress but to all the political parties who believe in secularism. I now find that some of our friends who consider themselves to be very revolutionary, more revolutionary than us, feel that an alliance with the communal forces in our States will pay them dividends in the coming elections. It is not only a question of the Congress, but if any secular political party wants to exploit the situation in this way, I would remind it that its fate will also be that of the Congress in Kerala. So if all the political parties in the country which believe in secularism decide that we shall not in any way directly or indirectly encourage the growth of the communal forces in the country, I think much of the instability in Kerala can be avoided.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: The Communist Party is now trying an alliance with those forces.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: You have your own time. You then speak what you want. What is it that forced the Congress to come into this kind of alliance with the communal forces during all these years? According to me, it is the intolerance on the part of the Congress to allow any other political party to grow in this country or at any time to take power in this country. You know the story of 1957 when the Communist Ministry was there. On the third day they started their struggle against the Communist Ministry, and it was led by Mr. Shriman Narayan—I do not want to go into all the details. After 1960 what happened? After the mid-term election there were only 30 persons in the opposition; only the Communists were in the opposition. and there was an alliance of all the other parties including the Muslim League. They had a Joint Parliamentary Board and all that. After some time the Muslim League was humiliated and let down. They had to walk out. Some people here and especially in the north feel that the Congress had done a good thing because by letting down the Muslim League they were fighting communalism. That was not the idea. If that were so, if it was as part of the struggle against communalism that they forced the Muslim League to leave the alliance, that it would have been a welcome thing. Then they would have done the other thing also. Shri Mannam would not have found a place. The Catholic Church would not have had this much of influence. What tempted them was that they did not want even to share power with anybody.

SHRIMATI DEVAKI GOPIDAS (Kerala): What is Mannam in the Congress?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: You do not know that even now. Your so-called Congressmen are more loyal to Mannam than to the Congress.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: As you were once doing . . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Stupidity is your name. What else can I say?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Be careful. You address the Chair.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: He did not mean that. (*Interruption.*)

1 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But why is he advancing in that direction?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Now, what I was driving at was this. After parting company with the Muslim League, what did they do next? They beheaded the PSP and threw it out of the Ministry. You know that Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai was the head of the PSP. One fine morning Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai who was the Chief Minister of Kerala was found in Punjab as the Governor. Did the PSP know about it? No. Did the all-India PSP leadership know about it? No. He was bribed by the Congress so that the Congress alone might take the whole power. As long as there is this intolerance there, you will never have a stable Ministry or sound democracy there. I put a question. You always quote the British example. Now, Mr. Churchill's contribution to the British nation especially during the wartime is not disputed by anybody. But after the war in the election when his party was thrown out, he did not lead a liberation struggle against anybody. He waited, he abided by the Constitution and he fought election next time. So, unless you have this kind of tolerance, you cannot have a proper functioning of democracy in this country. So, the ruling party has to take these factors into consideration.

Then, because of this constant instability in the State, what is happening there? The people and their pro-

blems are forgotten. It has always been an unfortunate affair that whenever we are on the eve of discussing the Plan, it is some officer from the Centre who knows very little about the State who rules our State. Now we are on the eve of discussing the Fourth Five Year Plan and the President's rule is there. You know how difficult it was to find out somebody to advise the Governor. It took so many days and finally one or two people were fixed. That is the position. And now they are to speak and fight for the State of Kerala when this question of discussion of the Fourth Plan comes up. This was exactly what happened when we were discussing the Third Plan also. This was exactly what happened when we were discussing Second Plan also.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Orissa is much worse even though we have a Ministry.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That is your problem. And again, because of this constant political crisis, even if there be a Ministry, will it have the time to attend to any of these things? No. Take for example one point. We have this ship-building yard allotted to Kerala in the Third Plan. Even today the agreement is not signed; except that some land has been acquired, nothing has happened. The other day the Minister said here that they were still negotiating. Then a pyro-chemical industry was sanctioned for Kerala. I do not know where it has gone now. Then, to quote another example, a precision instruments factory was allotted to it during the Third Plan period. Nothing has been done in that matter. So, all these things are going by default. And you know, Kerala is a problem State. Our people are industrious, intelligent but unfortunately we do not have the resources. Unless that State is industrialised, you cannot find a solution to the burning problems of that State, and in that matter we have been lagging far behind because of this political instability. So, I request now that the State has been

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair]

taken over by the Centre, that special attention should be paid, when we are discussing the question of the Fourth Five Year Plan, to see that our State also gets a legitimate share, so that we may be able to come out of the situation in which we are.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must now wind up.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I am concluding. From the details which the hon. Minister has placed before us, it is clear that there was no other way than to have the President's rule there under the circumstances. So, I also—I do not know whether I should support it—have to suffer it.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Madam, Deputy Chairman. I had been listening to the eloquent speech of Mr. M. N. Govindan Nair from Kerala, who is now attached to the right wing of the Communist Party of the State. He has rightly pointed out that this is the third time in this country that the President had to take over the administration of the Kerala State and that the political situation in that State is still in a confusion and much has to be done to find out a solution to have a stable Government for that State. I cannot agree with most of the points raised by Mr. M. N. Govindan Nair, pointing out the various developments on the political front from the very inception of democratic administration in the State. He has pointed out that in the first instance, immediately after the first General Election in the State, the Congress had a big majority. But what he stated was not absolutely correct since there was the Tamil Nad Congress which was opposing the State Congress. I think out of 108 people, some 14 or 15 were from the Tamil Nad area, who were . . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: What about the Congress?

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: . . . included in the opposition.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: If you will yield . . .

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: There is no question of my yielding.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has not yielded. Let him continue.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Madam, he has questioned the action of the President in dismissing the Communist Ministry which came into power in 1957. And he said that because of that action all these developments had occurred in that State in 1964. In this respect, I wish to bring to your notice again, as I had pointed out in 1960, what had actually happened in the State immediately after the Communist regime was established in the State. It was in 1957 that the Communist Party, with the support of five Independents, came into power in Kerala. As soon as they came into power, the first thing that they did was to establish a cell administration in that State. All the Communist cells were enlivened, and they had entrusted the administration to the Communist cells. These cells had issued summons and warrants to the citizens of the State. (Interruptions.) You please wait and see what actually happened from 1957 to 1960.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You do not know, it is particles.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: Madam, in 1957 they started issuing summons to the citizens of the State. There are instances where they inflicted punishments on some persons who refused to attend to their summons. In order to strengthen the cells, the Communist Party directed the Communist Government to revise and codify the Police Code so that the police must not interfere in any of the developments in the State. So the Communist Party took up the ad-

ministration. They could control even the Ministers and high-ups in the Communist Party. Unfortunately, the people had to suffer a lot because they could not get any assistance from the authorities. It was at that time that the people had to join together to face that situation. The people thought of joining together for giving resistance to this Communist aggression at that time.

Madam, as we have seen, it was not only violent, horrible tactics that were administered by the Communist Party but it was the corrupt practices and the various types of activities to misappropriate public funds that were adopted by the Communist Party. The Communist party even organised what they called Labour Contract Societies. They organised Tappers, Co-operative Societies for the tapping and selling of toddy in the State, and all these were given to them on a negotiated basis, part of the public funds going to the Communist Party and its leaders.

The negotiated contracts undertaken by these Communist societies were not actually implemented but by paper work they drew money and utilised it for their organisation and its leaders. The same thing happened on various other fronts, for example, in the Coir Society. In order to enable the Communists to dominate they extended grants and loans to the Communist Party members. They made an atmosphere so as to make people understand that only the Communist Party could survive in the State of Kerala. All these developments, Madam, made the people organise, what they called, the Liberation Movement.

The Liberation Movement gained strength each day and the Communist Party had to succumb to the movement organised by various sections of the State. I do agree that in that movement all the sections were there, sections which were really suppressed by the Communist goondas. Madam, all these things were happening.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What did he say? Suppose I say Congress goonda, would you like it?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should not have used that word.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: They may not be Communist goondas but they were goondas organised by the Communist Party. Actually, instances were quoted where daylight murders were committed by these goondas organised by the Communist Party. People were hunted on public roads. In one case seven or eight persons were taken away in jeeps, hands and legs bound. They were taken to the police station and these goondas asked the police to register cases against them and proceed with them. I can give instances. At Varantharappally seven persons were murdered by an organised Jatha of the Communist Party. These are all facts, seen in the 'True picture of Kerala,' published at that time. There were instances where even a Member of Parliament was assaulted. In 1957-58 I was General Secretary of the Congress. Myself and some ex-Chief Ministers were assaulted on a public road while we were leading a jatha. These things were carried on at that time. Therefore, it is no wonder that the people of the State organised themselves to face this Communist aggression.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Madam, this is an insult to us that even after we assaulted him he is there.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: So many assaults they were subjected to but they are there. The only thing is that their teeth are no more in some cases.

Unfortunately, we had to face so many such situations and, as he said, Kerala is suffering because of lack of a stable Government. For years together all the parties concerned including my party, were thinking about finding a solution to this but

[Shri Joseph Mathen]

we could not find a solution. Now, as he said, a number of parties have come out with their programme. They are welcome. Let them come and fight the elections single-handed. Then we will know what exactly is going to happen.

Here again we find that the Opposition parties of the State are now organising, what they call, amalgamation of all sorts of interests. And they are going to fight the Congress because they know that single-handed they cannot fight the Congress because the Congress has a programme to solve the various problems of the State. It is true that because of lack of a stable Government we could not solve most of the problems in the State and, as he said, some of the major projects that are to be undertaken are still lagging behind because there is nobody to follow it up. All these things are there. Still I say that the Congress will be able to deliver the goods, provided we are given the chance. As was pointed out by Mr. Govindan Nair, even though beheaded, the S.S.P. should fight single-handed. Whether beheaded or not, actually all these years we could not see the S.S.P. standing single-handed in the elections. Let the S.S.P. take up the challenge to fight single-handed as Mr. M. N. Govindan Nair has taken it up. I hope all the other parties are prepared to face the challenge. We take up the challenge. And as Congressmen we say that we take up the challenge that we will fight the elections single-handed and form a stable Government for at least five years. About that we are confident. I hope that while keeping political morality in mind, the Opposition parties at least this time will try to maintain political status of their own as much as possible whereby they may be able to say that they have not disturbed the political stability in the country. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI ANAND CHAND (Bihar):
Madam Deputy Chairman, I may be

pardoned for my intrusion in this debate coming as I do from the extreme North while the matter concerns one in the extreme South, a land about which I have heard so much but which unfortunately I have never visited. I further would like to point out to you, Madam Deputy Chairman, and to the House certain matters which are not directly in the scope of what the hon. speakers before me have related.

It is not for me to say about what is happening in Kerala, whether the Congress Party will again come to power or not. That is not the question at issue. To my mind, as I have seen, as an onlooker sees most of the game, the issue is one in which the State has had to come under the President's Rule thrice. Now it might be due to political instability, it might be due to casteism because in Kerala, as I see it, the castes are composed of Nairs, Christians or Ezhavas, or it might be the rate of literacy by which the people want satisfaction at the hands of the Government which they fail to keep. I am not directly concerned with all these problems. At the moment what I am very much concerned with is that the President's Rule is resorted to in a State under article 356 of our Constitution simply because of the fact that the Congress Party, up till now which was a majority party, could not sustain that majority and some people crossed the floor. Therefore, it is presumed that the Constitutional machinery in the State has failed.

Now I was very carefully going into the debates of the Constituent Assembly which drafted the Constitution of India. It was very clearly, at that time, asked as to what was the intention of article 356. Take, for example, the question of the Union Government as such. If there is a vote of no-confidence in the Government of the Union, there cannot be

President's Rule under our Constitution. There would be a Caretaker Government and there would be a fresh election. Now in the case of the States, the framers of the Constitution made a little distinction which was rather unfavourable to the States and they said that under article 356, if the constitutional machinery in the State failed, the President should take over and the Parliament would act as the interim Legislature till new elections were held but the intention was not to take it over just because a vote of no-confidence was passed. I was just going to refresh my memory from the Constituent Assembly debates and I would like with your permission to quote the words of Dr. B. R. Ambedkar. When he was asked about it at the time this article was being drafted as to what was the purpose, he said:

"I hope the first thing he will do would be to issue a mere warning to a province that has erred, that things were not happening in the way in which they were intended to happen in the Constitution. If that warning fails, the second thing for him to do will be to order an election allowing the people of the province to settle matters by themselves. It is only when these two remedies fail that he would resort to this article. It is only in those circumstances he would resort to this article. I do not think we could then say that these articles were imported in vain or that the President had acted wantonly."

I should have said that directly the people crossed over and they stood up in their seats—here I disagree with my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta when he said that the Governor should have acted immediately when he found that the people in the Opposition who stood up in favour of the motion of no-confidence were in a majority—there, as far as I know, the consensus is taken by the Speaker to find out whether a sufficient number of people

of the Legislature or the Parliament are in favour of the motion of no-confidence . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Being discussed . . .

SHRI ANAND CHAND: Yes, for the discussion. So when they stood up, the idea was whether there were enough people so that the motion of no-confidence may be put up for discussion as such.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here you are right but an unprecedented thing happened even at that stage. A clear majority in the House stood up in favour of the motion. The majority in the House stood up in favour of the motion and against the Government.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: I am afraid I cannot agree with that.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: What is the use of discussion then?

SHRI ANAND CHAND: Because it is clearly written in the Governor's report and the Governor's report, the synopsis of which has appeared, says that on 3rd September when the Legislative Assembly met, the Leader of the Opposition of the same Socialist Party moved a motion of no-confidence. This was allowed by the Speaker when all the Opposition Parties and the dissident Congressmen stood up in support of the motion and the Speaker then set apart September 7th and 8th for discussion. I think it is quite clear. So I am afraid I do not agree with the contention that at that time the Governor should have acted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Ministry should have resigned.

SHRI ANAND CHAND: The Ministry should not have resigned till a vote of no-confidence was placed before it. That is my contention. That is what I say. We can differ. I only say that because I thought that there

[Shri Anand Chand]

was something which is not quite clear in the way it has been put.

I go to the next point that on the resignation of the Ministry, a fresh election should be held. Why is this question waiting? I was rather surprised to hear from my friend here who is the Communist spokesman from Kerala that he agrees with the President's Rule till such time as the elections are due in February next. Why? Is that because the Communist Party itself is split into two factions and they think that if the elections are not held just now, it would be favourable to them? On the other hand my friend from the Congress Benches says that if the elections are held, he will see that he will come back in a majority and till such time as they are in a majority and are able to form a stable Government, there should be no progress in the country. This is something, to my mind, which is injuring the cause of democracy in this country. I am speaking on a very wide plane. I am not speaking here siding with one or the other. I am saying that as time advances—after all the Congress is the Ruling Party now and there are the Opposition Parties—we cannot have in India of the future a caucus in which one Party is ruling not only in the Centre but in the States for all time to come. There is bound to be a readjustment in democracy, and in that readjustment not only in the State of Kerala but in many other States, instances can come where the Congress as such is not in a majority or where the Congress Party as such in the State Legislature is outvoted on a motion of no-confidence. Is then the Centre to use these powers which are to be used, and which the framers of the Constitution wanted to be used only in very exceptional circumstances, are they to be used as veneer or as an excuse for putting back the Congress into power after the Governor's Rule? That would reduce democracy to a mere mockery. That

would reduce the States to nothing but mere municipalities which we have been contending they are being reduced to slowly and gradually. So my submission is this that this article should only have been brought in after the warning had been given, after the elections had been held and still if a stable Government was not formed, then the Governor could have reported and he could have told the Centre that there was no stable Ministry, that they had had elections and even those elections had not produced a stable Government and therefore the President should take over the rule of the State of Kerala and in due course of time try to find a way in which the people should be governed by a more stable Government. That, I should think, should have been the answer. Otherwise what is going to happen is this. Here was this question. If we go back into the history of the dissident Congressmen, we all know that they belonged to a certain group or a certain Home Minister. I am sorry I did not know because I was out of the country but I was shocked to hear that he is no more there, the former Home Minister, but allegations were made against him. There were enquiries and counter-enquiries. He had a certain group of people. They took revenge. They went out of the Congress and at the appropriate time brought about the downfall of the Ministry. All these things are inherent in the political situation of India. We speak of casteism. We dub the Congress as taking caste votes or the Scheduled Caste votes. I agree to that but then the point is, is the social structure or fabric of this country not built on the caste system? It has not changed. No political party till now has tried to change it. I was speaking to an hon. Member about a by-election here—I will not name him—the other day in the Central Hall. There is going to be a by-election in some State or the other and he was saying that such and such candidate would win because his community is more in number in the assembly cons-

tituency, and one caste is more than the other and unless he is opposed by a Member of the same Caste, his chances are good. Therefore this is the fabric of the country. This is the social condition under which we live. We should all try to change them and the best way to change is when these elections are fought, we do not fight on the basis of casteism we do not put in candidates there because they happen to be of particular castes but they are put on the basis of idealism or political programmes of the country.

So far as this particular problem is concerned, although my friend from Kerala has agreed that the President's Proclamation is good—and he said under the circumstances—I beg to disagree. I think this should not have been done. I think the Proclamation should come only in an instance where he must first give a warning as it was envisaged, and after the elections had been held. They should have been held immediately after the vote of no-confidence was passed, and should not have been delayed. I saw here a newspaper report in which somebody was asked—some Central Minister—when the elections could be held and he said that it was for the Election Commission to decide. I should have thought that directly there was a no-confidence motion passed and the Ministry fell, the elections should take place immediately. Let the elected representatives of the people who are no longer there and who have lost their confidence go back to the electorate and seek a fresh mandate. Why should we wait? By this waiting what we mean is that we shall try to fish in troubled waters, try to realign our forces, try and put one community against another and then try to have a kind of majority. This way we move not merely towards disintegration; we bring in again political instability, and if we start at one end, Kerala, the example is likely to catch on and to be followed elsewhere too and my submission is that it would be very difficult for us then and we may have to have President's

Rule in due course in practically every other State where the trouble brews and it becomes unmanageable; this would only tend to weaken the structure of democracy in this country. As such, although the move is there and I know the House would support it, I for one feel that as a matter of principle I cannot support the motion which is before the House.

Thank you.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I assure all the Members including the Member who spoke last that we feel as much as any other Member here or any citizen of this great country that the democratic set-up in Kerala had to be discontinued and President's Rule had to be imposed, and we do want, at the earliest opportunity, that democratic set-up to be established in that disturbed part of our country.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI ANAND CHAND) in the Chair.]

Now, Sir, I want also to tell my friends that the course that the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs adopted, to limit himself to the present circumstances and not go into the previous history, was a right one. But as Mr. Govindan Nair was inclined to go into the past history of the case, obviously, Mr. Joseph Mathen had to give certain facts, which of course cannot be questioned but, so far as answering the points is concerned, if you permit me, Sir, I will begin with joy.

You have raised a constitutional point, and I may say, sir, it is a point which certainly deserves consideration. You have referred, Sir, to the speech of Dr. Ambedkar in the Constituent Assembly to suggest that he envisaged a warning and then election, even though a certain definite wording was incorporated in article 356. Now, Sir, you know very well, much better than I do, that when an article has been framed, the wording of the article has to be fol-

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

lowed, and not the speeches of the framers of this Constitution. Having that in view in this particular case, I think we should see what the position was when it was known that the no-confidence motion had been passed there. What was the position? And what could the Governor or the Government or the Legislature do? If your interpretation is to be followed that as the democratic Government had fallen there, we should give them a warning, conduct an election and until the termination of the election the same Ministry should be continued, then, with due respect to you, Sir, I should think that that is not the direction of the Constitution, and the moment the vote of no-confidence was passed the Ministry had to go. In the circumstances, Sir, the Governor took all the necessary precautions, and the directions under the Constitution.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We do not want a rotten Ministry.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: And the moment the Governor received intimation of the no-confidence motion having been passed, he called the leaders of all other parties, including the leader of the Communist Party . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Including the meeting that Mr. S. K. Patil, who went from here, had there.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Please wait, Mr. Gupta. I know you get pleasure in interrupting me, as occasionally I do. I would submit, Sir, that when the Governor found that no group, no party, was able to form a Government, the only course left open to him was to seek and have President's Rule there. So in the circumstances of the case, Sir, I think, as the Communist Party also agrees, there was no other alternative left under the Constitution except to impose President's Rule.

(Interruptions)

Coming to the points raised by the Communist Party, I think we all know, and just to refresh my memory I read the debate in 1959.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Which debate?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It is no use pretending not to know; I mean the debate when that Resolution was passed, when, on account of the liberation movement, the Communist Government had to go, when all sorts of things were done—at least they were alleged to have been done by the Communist party as just now pointed out by my friend, Mr. Joseph Mathen, when they attempted to prolong Communist rule and in the process did injustice to others who did not fall in line with them. And so far as the taxpayers' money was concerned, many things were done, and I am sure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta also will not support such actions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have you read your own speech on that occasion, when you supported the Congress-Muslim League alliance?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Yes, I have; no, Mr. Gupta is hopelessly mistaken. I said then and I shall say now, just after a few minutes, how I view this question. For the moment I shall submit that we are sorry in view of what had happened, where everything was very unstable, but let us now, while approving the Resolution, consider dispassionately, consider with a search in our hearts, what has led to this instability and what efforts should be made to see that our brethren, our friends in Kerala, have an honest and stable Government. Even if there is a stable Government, if it is not an honest Government, I can assure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that it will not receive support from this side of the House. Now the position is this. However we may not like it, notwithstanding the high standard of education, notwithstanding the intelligence that part of the

country possesses, notwithstanding the general level or the economic standard—which, I would say, is also much better than in other parts of India—still, we see instability there and change of Ministry every now and then, and my reading of the situation is that communalism is at its height there, and with all the admonition, with all the good advice, and with all the preachings of the high principles that my friend from the Communist side made, I read in today's papers that the Communist Party is hobnobbing with communal parties

SHRI K DAMODARAN (Kerala): No, no

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN It really pains me

SHRI K DAMODARAN It is a wrong impression

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN I hope it is wrong, I do pray it is wrong, but there it is, and the past record of the Communist Party also corroborates what has appeared in today's papers

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA You have become a political divorcee because the Muslim League has left you

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN I would like to tell my friend that this marriage of convenience is always dangerous, and it is high time that all the parties concerned made a definite resolution and determination that they would not stoop down and compromise the principles. I would say I would not mind if the Congress party does not come into power. I would, however, like the Communist Party to stick to its principles and not have any compromise with any communal party, whether it be the Christian communal party, whether it be the Muslim communal party or whether it be the Hindu communal party or the Nairs. This is the question we have to face now for such an enlightened State. I call it enlightened, because as

you know, people say when they go to the Secretariat, wherever they look, they see Menons. In fact they sometimes say it is 'Menongitis'. Why is it so? On account of their intelligence, on account of their hard work, they have come in and established themselves. But what a travesty of things and how painful it is, that in such a State the Ministry during the last 12 years should be so unstable? That was the only State where the Opposition Party had come into power. I must say that the credit should go to the Central Government and to the Congress Party that when the electorate elected the Communist Party to power, they most willingly welcomed it. We welcomed it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA How wonderful.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN It stands to their credit

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What else could you do?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN Even now I say if we had not stuck to our principles if we had compromised with the fifteen dissidents, I can assure my hon friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, we would have been in the saddle there. If only we had made some compromise with any other party, we would have been in the saddle there. I appreciate the conduct of the Congress Party in Kerala and I compliment them and I am glad they gave up their position and did not compromise their principles and I do hope that the same principle will be kept up.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA The terms put forward by the dissidents were not compromisable at all.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN My hon friend Shri Lokanath Misra will appreciate their stand.

PROF M B LAL (Uttar Pradesh): The Congress Party could not find someone acceptable to the entire party.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I could not follow the remark of Professor Sahib.

PROF. M. B. LAL: I said it happened so because it was not possible for the Congress Party there to find someone acceptable to the entire party as its leader.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am afraid I differ from Professor Sahib there. If some compromise had been made with the fifteen dissidents compromising the principles, we would have found out somebody.

PROF. M. B. LAL: A leader could not be found.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: A leader could have been found if some adjustments were made. But it was a question of adherence to principles.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then the others would have left you.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: No, I can assure my hon. friend that we did not want to remain in the Government by compromising principles.

PROF. M. B. LAL: I would like the hon. Member to tell us what principle was involved there.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Anyhow, what I want to impress upon this august House and especially on friends on the side opposite, friends of the P.S.P. or the new S.S.P.—of course the Swatantra Party has no place in Kerala—and others is this. Let them stand for certain principles and let them say what is important is not who wins the elections, but who upholds the Directive Principles of our Constitution, who upholds the basic principles of democracy, who upholds the integrity and honour of the country. They should also see that no compromise is made either with the vested interests or with the communal forces. We should go on trying to bring about the eradication of poverty, and provide more facilities for education of our

people and more economic avenues for our people and a better and prosperous life for that State. That is the aim and object which the Congress has in this land and we will work for that. I hope at least through the efforts of Shri Bhupesh Gupta, the revered leader of the group or the rightists of the Communist Party, we will see that group not compromising their principles and we hope also that they will be able to stand on their own feet, whether they win the elections or lose the elections. I can assure my hon. friends that I am sure that the Congress Party and the Congress President and the Congress leaders will also see that whether the Congress wins or loses, there is no compromise on the question of principles. So let us build up now. I feel, Sir, and I feel it every moment of my life now, that after the demise of our revered leader, the responsibility on us is very much greater. We have to see to it that we put our shoulders and we all try to keep up the principles and the ideals for which he lived and died. So I would emphasise at this juncture is that so far as the Congress Party is concerned, we all share the sorrow at the break-up of this democratic set-up. But let us take a lesson from what has happened previously and let us put our shoulders together and see that in the most intelligent and educationally advanced State we establish a government which is secular, which is democratic and which accepts the socialistic principles.

With these words, Sir, I recommend to this House the acceptance of the Resolution moved by the Home Minister as there was no other alternative left for that State.

I thank you, Sir.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नाचलजी चौरडिया
(मध्य प्रदेश) : उपमहाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव विचारार्थ आया है उसे हमारे देशके एक विशेषभाग में एक विशेष परिस्थिति का निर्माण होने के परिणामस्वरूप लाना पड़ता

है। ऐसी परिस्थिति का क्यों निर्माण हुआ ? मैं जिस क्षेत्र का रहने वाला हूँ वह उससे काफी दूर है, परन्तु परिस्थितियों की जानकारी होने की वजह से मेरा निवेदन है कि इसको देखने के लिए हमें उसके पूर्व इतिहास की ओर भी जाना पड़ेगा।

स्वतंत्रता-प्राप्ति से पूर्व वह एक स्टेट थी और स्टेट के प्रमुख नायर थे और नायर के प्रमुख होने के नाते वहाँ पर नायर्स का प्रभाव ज्यादा था और इसके परिणामस्वरूप जो दूसरे पक्ष थे वे तुलनात्मक दृष्टि से कुछ उपेक्षित थे, वे अपने आप को दबा हुआ महसूस करते थे और वे चाहते थे कि अवनर मिलने पर हम भी आगे बढ़ कर प्रशासन में अगुआ बनें, प्रशासन में हिस्सा बताएं—ऐसी उनकी भावना थी। स्वतंत्रता-प्राप्ति के पश्चात् उनको कुछ मौका मिला और उन्होंने भी भिन्न-भिन्न राजनैतिक दलों के साथ मिल कर के प्रशासन में भाग लेने की चेष्टा की। हमारी कांग्रेस ने—चाहे उस समय आश्वासन दे कर या चाहे लोगों ने यह अपेक्षा कर के कि हम कांग्रेस के साथ प्रशासन देंगे तो वह हमारी ज्यादा उन्नति कर सकेगी—इस वजह से प्रशासन को अपने हाथ में लिया और जो गुट विशेष थे वे इस बात का प्रयत्न करते रहे, सौदेबाजी के आधार पर या किसी भी आधार पर, कि जो भी सत्ता में है उन से हम अधिक से अधिक प्राप्त करें। १९५७ तक यह अपेक्षा रही और उस अपेक्षा के बाद कुछ गुट बने जो कि चार हिस्सों में बांटे जा सकते हैं—एक तो नायर्स है, दूसरे ईजावास हैं, तीसरे क्रिश्चियंस हैं और चौथे मुस्लिम लीगी हैं और ये चारों गुप्त प्रमुख लोगों के—मैं यह नहीं कहता कि सभी लोग जाति के आधार पर हैं—बांटे हुए हैं और इसी आधार पर बांटे हुए हैं। तो बड़े बड़े हिस्सों के इन आधार पर होने की वजह से और उनकी जो सौदेबाजी की बातें हैं, उसके परिणामस्वरूप वह परिणाम रहा है। चाहे अकबर अनी साहब यहां पर बड़े ज़ोरदार शब्दों में कहें

कि हम बिल्कुल साम्प्रदायिकता को दूर कर के असाम्प्रदायिक आधार पर सब कुछ कर रहे हैं लेकिन उन को वहां पर मुस्लिम लीग के साथ समझौता कर के प्रशासन चलाने का प्रयत्न करना पड़ा, वहां जो साम्प्रदायिकता की मूल है, जो लीग है, उसको ही साथ ले कर, उसके साथ ही गठबन्धन कर के अपना काम चलाना पड़ा। तो क्या हम ने सिद्धान्तों का वहां हनन नहीं किया था, क्या हम ने सिद्धान्तों पर कुठाराघात नहीं किया था, परन्तु चूंकि वहां विशेष परिस्थिति है, इसलिए ऐसा करना पड़ा होगा और इसका मूल कारण यह है कि वहां पर जितने गुट हैं, वह यह चाहते हैं कि सौदेबाजी कर के हम जिससे भी अधिक से अधिक प्राप्त कर सकें वह करें। वहां चाहे जितनी पढ़ाई हो गई हो, चाहे जितनी एजुकेशन हो गई हो, चाहे जितनी एजुकेशन आगे बढ़ी हो, लेकिन मूल में उनके यही भावना है कि गुट विशेष को लाभ पहुंचाए और इसी भावना से वह आज कभी इस गुट के साथ हो जाते हैं तो कल कभी उस गुट के साथ हो जाते हैं और अपेक्षा करते हैं कि कांग्रेस सरकार से लाभ नहीं मिला तो कम्प्यूनिस्टों को प्रोत्साहन दो, कम्प्यूनिस्टों से लाभ नहीं मिला तो पी० एस० पी० को प्रोत्साहन दो और जब किसी से लाभ नहीं मिल रहा है तो इस तरह से खींचतानी की जा रही है जिससे केरल का प्रशासन बड़ी गड़बड़ में पड़ा हुआ है, उस गड़बड़ को दूर करने के लिये यह आवश्यक है कि कुछ न कुछ व्यवस्था की जा सके। अराजकता की स्थिति का बना रहना वहां के लिये उचित नहीं समझा जाता और उसके लिये महामहिम राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने जो वहां पर प्रेसीडेंट रूल चलाया वह आवश्यक था और उसके बिना गति नहीं थी इसलिये ऐसा हुआ। मगर केरल को एक टेस्ट समझ कर हमारे कांग्रेस दल को ही नहीं, बल्कि सब लोगों को इस बात का नोट लेना चाहिये कि अगर ऐसी स्थिति सभी प्रांतों में होती है तो क्या परिणाम होगा ? हम नहीं अपेक्षा करते हैं

[श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया]

कि ऐसा अन्य प्रान्तों में हो पर हम ने प्रशासन करना है तो एक वस्तुस्थिति को भी सामने लाकर और उसको ध्यान में रख कर आगे बढ़ना चाहिये और इसलिये यह अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि—चाहे आप ने यह नहीं माना कि साम्प्रदायिक आधार आप का रहा है कि अमुक सम्प्रदाय के लोग अमुक जगह ज्यादा रहते हैं तो उन से ज्यादा बोट मिलेंगे और अकबर अली खां साहब ने भी कहा है कि साम्प्रदायिकता से समझौता नहीं होना चाहिये—हमें साम्प्रदायिक आधार से दूर रहना चाहिये, मगर अगर सारे इलेक्शन को उठा कर आप देखें तो सौ में पच्चावन कैसे ऐसे मिलेंगे जिन में इन विचारों, को इन कन्सीडरेशन्स को, ध्यान में रखते हुए टिकट भी दिये जाते हैं, व्यवस्था भी की जाती है, नहीं तो चुनाव में हार खानी पड़ती है। चुनाव के समय योग्यता काम नहीं करती, योग काम करता है और योग वहां काम करता है जहां कोई सम्प्रदाय में बाहुल्य रखता है या उसमें विशेष महत्व रखता है। तो ऐसी स्थिति में जो मूलभूत कमियां हमारे समाज में हैं, हम सिद्धान्त के आधार पर समझते हैं कि सच बोलना चाहिये और सच बोल कर समाज की व्यवस्था ठीक रखनी है। मुझ अकबर अली साहब बतलाएं, कितने लोग देश में सच बोल पाते हैं?

شری اکبر علی خاں : کوشش تو

کونا ہی ہے -

†[श्री अकबर अली खां : कोशिश तो करना है ही।]

†[] Hindi transliteration.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया :

सिद्धांत तो अच्छा है, मगर सिद्धांत की प्रैक्टिकेविलिटी का ध्यान में रख कर प्रशासन चलाया जाना चाहिये। शासन सिद्धांत का प्रतिपादन उसी सीमा तक करता है, जब तक वह कार्य रूप में परिणत नहीं होता। सिद्धांत के आधार पर हमें चीन से झगड़ा नहीं करना चाहिये, पाकिस्तान से झगड़ा नहीं करना चाहिये। सिद्धांत का आधार सिद्धांत की जगह होता है, प्रशासन का आधार प्रशासन की जगह होता है। प्रशासन का लक्ष्य है—देश में शांति रहनी चाहिये। अगर शासन यह देखे कि केरल की स्थिति खराब है, तो राष्ट्रपति का शासन भी लागू करना पड़ तो करे, मगर यह स्थिति सारे प्रान्तों में धीरे धीरे खड़ी होती जा रही है। साम्प्रदायिकता के आधार पर, जिसको कि अलग अलग गुट का नाम दिया जाता है, मध्य प्रदेश का ही उदाहरण आप देख लीजिए। वहां पर मिश्र जी का गुट अलग, तख्तमल जैन का गुट अलग, जो कि जातीय आधार लिये हुए बना है। अगर एक जैन कांग्रेस है, तो एक अजैन कांग्रेस है और उन के आपस में झगड़े से जो खींचतान मची हुई है उससे न जाने कब क्या परिस्थिति पैदा हो जाय। वहां अभी इतने अधिक पढ़े लिखे लोग नहीं हैं जो इस स्थिति का निर्माण कर रहे हैं, लेकिन धीरे धीरे सारे प्रान्तों में चाहें उड़ीसा को ले लीजिए, बंगाल को ले लीजिए, महाराष्ट्र को ले लीजिए, उत्तर प्रदेश को ले लीजिए, समस्त भारतवर्ष में विघटनकारी मनोवृत्ति बढ़ती जा रही है और यह हमारे देश की अक्षुण्णता के लिये खतरा है। यदि हम इस घटना से सावधान नहीं होंगे तो आगे चलकर बहुत बड़े खतरे में पड़ जायेंगे। हमारे देश में यह जो फंडरल टाइप आफ गवर्नमेंट चल रही है यह लाभदायक नहीं है, किसी रोज हमारे देश को बहुत बड़ा खतरा पैदा हो सकता है। यूनिटरी टाइप आफ गवर्न-

मेंट के बारे में हमें सोचना चाहिये जिस से कि हम अपने देश की एकात्मकता को अक्षुण्णता को कायम रखते हुए भी प्रजातांत्रिक तरीके से अपना शासन चला सकें। (Inter-ruption) सांप्रदायिकता के आधार पर जो झगड़े अलग अलग गुटों में होते हैं उनका असर यूनिटरी टाइप आफ गवर्नमेंट पर उतना ही नहीं पड़ेगा जितना आज छोटे ग्रुप के आधार पर पड़ता है। संप्रदायिकता समाप्त करने के लिये हमारी कांग्रेस सरकार अथक प्रयत्न कर रही है, इसके लिये मूल उद्देश्य लेकर तो चल रही है, मगर जब भी मौका आता है तो उस के सामने घुटने टेक देती है। इसलिये उसका प्रेक्टिकल हल केवल नारे लगाने से नहीं उसे कार्यरूप में परिणत करने से होता है। जो मुख्य प्रशासन करने वाली देश की सब से बड़ी पार्टी है वह इस बारे में उदाहरण प्रस्तुत करने में अपने को असमर्थ पाती है; क्योंकि अगर समर्थ हो जायेगी तो अगले इलेक्शन में पृथ्वी जैसे गोल है वैसे अपना मामला भी गोल हो जायेगा।

तो ऐसी स्थिति में शासन को आज यह विचार करना चाहिये कि सांप्रदायिकता के नाम पर इस प्रकार की परिस्थिति का निर्माण न हो और भविष्य में हमारे देश की अक्षुण्णता को धक्का न लगे, इसके लिये प्रयत्न हो। आज हमें इस बात पर अच्छी तरह से सोच-विचार करना है कि हम अपने यहां पर इस फेडरल टाइप आफ गवर्नमेंट को समाप्त करके यूनिटरी टाइप आफ गवर्नमेंट की व्यवस्था करेंगे, तो हम एक बहुत बड़ा खतरा जो आने वाला है, उससे अपनी रक्षा कर सकेंगे; अन्यथा धीरे धीरे आज यहां पर आ रहा है, कल मध्य प्रदेश, में परसों उड़ीसा में और फिर इसके बात बंगाल में, फिर उत्तर प्रदेश में—यह जो “वेन” चलने वाला है—इससे सावधान होने की आवश्यकता है। आशा

है, यह प्रशासन इसके बारे में कुछ विचार करेगा।

इसके साथ ही, जो अभी वर्तमान स्थिति में अस्थायी रूप से चलाने के लिये हमारे महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपना शासन लागू किया है, उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्य प्रदेश):
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, केरल में ८ तारीख को अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पास हुआ और ९ तारीख को गवर्नर ने पूरी कोशिश की कि अगर हो सके तो मुखालिफ पार्टियों को बुला कर वहां राष्ट्रपति का शासन लागू करने की कोशिश न की जाये, बल्कि वहां कोई आल्टरनेटिव गवर्नमेंट बना सकें तो अच्छा हो। वहां उस समय पोजीशन यह थी कि कांग्रेस के दो दो दलों में से एक तरफ १५ सदस्य थे और दूसरी तरफ ५० सदस्य थे, पी० एस० पी० के १५ सदस्य थे, “राइट”, कम्यूनिस्ट १६ थे, “लेफ्ट” कम्यूनिस्ट ६ थे, मुसलिम लीग के ११ थे, १ आर० एस० पी० का था और एक सीट खाली भी थी। तो सब पार्टियों को बुला कर गवर्नर ने बातचीत की लेकिन कोई पार्टी गवर्नमेंट नहीं बना सकी। आखिर में उन्होंने यहां केन्द्र को रिपोर्ट दी कि यहां आल्टरनेटिव गवर्नमेंट नहीं बन सकती है। तो सिवाय इस के कोई और रास्ता नहीं था केन्द्रीय सरकार के सामने और राष्ट्रपति के सामने कि गवर्नर की रिपोर्ट आने के बाद तक वे वहां राष्ट्रपति का शासन जारी करें। इसलिये उचित हुआ कि इस बारे में राष्ट्रपति का प्रोक्लेशन जारी हो और आज हमारे सामने यह एक तरह से कांस्टिट्यूशनल फारमेलिटी है कि हम उस घोषणा का, प्रोक्लेशन का, समर्थन करें। यह बहुत मुनासिब बात है। इसमें यह कहना कि राष्ट्रपति ने जल्दी की, या और ज्यादा वहां कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट को, वहां के

[श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय]

ही चीफ मिनिस्टर को, मौका देना चाहिये था, यह ठीक नहीं है। यह बहुत अच्छा हुआ कि वहां राष्ट्रपति का शासन कायम हो गया और चुनाव होंगे।

यहां कुछ सदस्यों ने अपने भाषणमें कहा कि यह बीच का काल क्यों है, फौरन ही वहां चुनाव हो जाने चाहियें। लेकिन मेरा खयाल है, राष्ट्रपति का शासन और केन्द्रीय सरकार इस बात को ध्यान में रखेंगे कि जल्दी से जल्दी वहां चुनाव हों, उसमें अनुचित रूप से कोई देरी लगने की जरूरत नहीं है बल्कि वहां जो व्यक्ति काम करने के लिये भेजे जायें या भेजे गए हों, वे बहुत अच्छे होने चाहियें, निष्पक्ष होने चाहियें। फ्री एण्ड फेयर इलेक्शन वहां जरूर होगा और अफसरों को यह समझना चाहिये कि कांग्रेस पार्टी को फेवर करने वाली बात या किसी और पार्टी को फेवर करने वाली बात न हो। हमारे आफिसर्स काफी तजुर्बेकार हैं और वहां की जनता भी पढ़ी लिखी और होशियार है। ऐसा नहीं है कि किसी आफिसर के कहने से ही वोट दे दे। केरल की जनता और प्रान्तों के मुकाबले में ज्यादा शिक्षित हैं। इसलिये जल्द से जल्द वहां चुनाव होंगे, फेयर इलेक्शन होगा, ऐसी में उम्मीद करता हूं।

2 P.M.

इसलिए इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करना एक कान्स्टीट्यूशनल फार्मेलिटी है। इसके बाद जो दूसरा बिल डेलीगेशन आफ पावर्स का आने वाला है उसे भी पार्लियामेंट को पास करना जरूरी है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रस्ताव के समन के समय कुछ दीगर बातें दूसरे हाउस में और इस हाउस में सदस्यों द्वारा कही गई हैं। उसमें एक यह बात भी कही गई है कि कांग्रेस संस्था निकम्मी साबित हुई है और केरल में जो अनस्टैबिलिटी है वह

कांग्रेस संस्था की ही वजह से हुई है। हम कुछ सदस्यों ने कांग्रेस के बहुत से दोष गिनाये और यह बयान किया कि उस प्रान्त में स्टैबिलिटी नहीं आ सकती है और अगर आ सकती है तो कम्युनिस्ट हुकूमत द्वारा ही आ सकती है, किसी दूसरे के द्वारा नहीं आ सकती है। कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि वहां पर जो कास्ट सिस्टम है वह बहुत डीप रूटेड है और वहां पर जातियों का इस तरह से अनुपात है कि वहां पर कुछ न कुछ अनस्टैबिलिटी बनी हीरगी।

कुछ सदस्यों का विचार तो यहां तक है कि हमें कान्स्टीट्यूशन को बदल देना चाहिये और उसमें कोई ऐसा मुनासिब चेन्ज होना चाहिये जिससे जो मौजूदा डेमोक्रेसी हमारे यहां है—जो ब्रिटिश कान्स्टीट्यूशनल ढंग पर है, हमारे यहां केबिनेट सिस्टम है—वह हिन्दुस्तान के लिए ठीक नहीं है और इस सिस्टम में चेन्ज होना चाहिये। इस बारे में मेरा अपना खयाल है। मैंने हाल ही में एक किताब, जो एक अमरीकन ने लिखी है, पढ़ी और उसका नाम है "India the most dangerous decades" यह किताब मि० हैरिसन ने, जो कि एक जर्नलिस्ट है, लिखी है और ये हिन्दुस्तान में काफी घूमे हैं तथा हिन्दुस्तान के पालिटिक्स के जो बड़े बड़े फैक्टर्स हैं उनका इन्होंने अध्ययन किया है। उन्होंने अपनी किताब में यह लिखा है कि हिन्दुस्तान में कास्ट लैग्वेज की जो लाबी है वह बहुत जोरों से डेवलप हो रही है और हर एक प्रान्त में इस चीज का बहुत जोर है। जैसे आन्ध्र में खामाज और रेड्डीज का जोर है। मैसूर में बोकालिगास और सिगायटस का जोर है और केरल में, नाययर, ईडावास, ईसाई, और कुछ प्रपोरशन में मुसलमान भी काफी बड़ी संख्या में हैं। इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि केरल में ये एलिमेन्ट्स मौजूद हैं, और कांग्रेस रूल ने इन एलिमेन्ट्स को बढ़ावा दिया है या कास्ट सिस्टम को वहां पर फैलाया है,

यह कहना गलत बात है । कांग्रेस सारे प्रान्तों में और सारे देश में यह कोशिश कर रही है कि हम सब लोग कास्ट सिस्टम और लिग्विस्टिक की बात को भूल जायें । कांग्रेस तो सब से पहले देश में होमोजेनिटी के सवाल को सोचेगी और वह सोचती भी आई है और वह इस पर कार्य कर रही है । वह चाहती है कि देश से कास्ट और लिग्विस्टिक का मसला हमेशा के लिए समाप्त हो जाये लेकिन यह बहुत डीप रूटेड है । मैं इतना ही कहूँगा कि कांग्रेस को यह दोष देना कि उसकी वजह से वहाँ पर अनस्टैबिलिटी आई है, ऐसी बात नहीं है । जो कांग्रेस को दोष देने के भागी हैं, उन्हें वहाँ की परिस्थिति पर विचार करना चाहिये कि वहाँ पर इस तरह की स्थिति हमेशा के लिए नहीं चल सकती है । मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस में कुछ खराबियाँ हैं अगर उन्हें मान भी लिया जाय, तो मैं यह जरूर महसूस करता हूँ कि अगर दूसरी पार्टियों के हाथ में हुक्मत आयेगी तो वे कांग्रेस से ज्यादा पावर इन्क होने वाली हैं । आप केरल के इतिहास को देख लीजिये, जब पहले वहाँ पर कम्युनिस्ट सरकार आई तो उसके जमाने में और उसके हाथों बेहद खराबियाँ हुईं । इसी तरह से पी० ए० पी० की हुक्मत को देख लीजिये, उसमें भी खराबियाँ आईं, तो इस तरह से किसी एक पार्टी को दोष देना बेकार है । अब वहाँ पर इन्वेक्शन होने जा रहे हैं और हम सब लोग आशा करते हैं कि कोई स्टैबिल गवर्नमेंट कायम हो जायेगी और इस दिशा में हम सब लोगों को काम करना चाहिये ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, केरल में जो जात्र पांत का सवाल है, वह केवल वही ही नहीं है बल्कि सभी जगह पर है । लेकिन केरल में तीन चार बड़े बड़े हिस्से हैं जो कभी इधर मिल जाते हैं और कभी उधर मिल जाते हैं । पहली बार वे कम्युनिस्टों के साथ मिले, और उनकी पार्टी की वहाँ

पर जीत हुई । श्री मन्नम की पार्टी का कभी कम्युनिस्टों को सपोर्ट मिल जाता है और कभी वे कांग्रेस पार्टी के साथ मिल जाते हैं और इस तरह से वहाँ पर तरह तरह के कौम्बीनेशन होते रहते हैं । मैं एक सोशल वर्कर हूँ और यह फील करता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे इन्टर-कास्ट मैरिज का सिलसिला जारी होना चाहिये, इस तरह की शादियाँ होनी चाहियें, जिस से सारा समाज मिलकर एक हो जाये । अगर इस तरह की बात हो जायेगी तो जात्र पांत का भी झगड़ा नहीं रहेगा और यह तब ही हमारे देश से निकल सकती है । लेकिन देश की जैसी आजकल हालत है उस से हमें निवटना है और कांग्रेस ही देश में एक ऐसा दल है जो जात्र पांत के खिलाफ हमेशा आवाज उठाता रहा है ।

इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि हमारे देश में जो यह कास्ट सिस्टम है और लोग छोटी छोटी जातियों में बंटे हुए हैं यह एक ट्राइबल आइडिया है और इस से हमें कभी न कभी अपना पिंड छुड़ाना ही पड़ेगा । हमारे देश में जो छोटी छोटी जातियाँ हैं जिन्हें शूद्र कहते थे उन्हें शिक्षा से महसूस किया जाता था और इसके बारे में एक वाक्य इस प्रकार से बना रखा था "स्त्री शूद्र नौधीयाताम्" यानी स्त्री और शूद्रों को शिक्षा नहीं देनी चाहिये । अब वह पुराना जमाना चला गया है और पुराने जमाने में जो ऊँच नीच के आधार पर वर्ण-व्यवस्था कायम थी, उसको हमें खत्म करना चाहिये और वह खत्म हो कर रहेगी ।

एक और विचार दूसरे हाउस में श्री खाडिलकरजी ने दिया है और वह थोड़ी गौर करने लायक बात है । उन्होंने कहा है कि कोई एक ऐसा रास्ता निकाला जाये जिस से चुनाव के बाद सब पार्टियाँ मिल कर एक

[श्री गोपकृष्ण द्विजयवर्गीय]

गवर्नमेंट बना ले या मिलजुल कर काम कर सके। उस हाउस में श्री रंगा साहब ने कहा कि हमें स्विस् पैटर्न पर अपना कान्स्टीट्यूशन बदलना चाहिये। जहा तक कान्स्टीट्यूशन को बदलने का सवाल है उस पर मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है। लेकिन मैं यह बात मानता हू कि अगर भारतवर्ष की सब पोलिटिकल पार्टिया मिल जुल कर और सहिष्णुता के साथ आपस में काम करे तो यह देश के लिए अच्छा होगा, केरल के लिए अच्छा होगा और सब देशों के लिए भी अच्छा होगा। इस विचार को मौजूदा कान्स्टीट्यूशन के तहत अमल में नहीं लाया जा सकता है, लेकिन बाद में सोच समझकर और देश की परिस्थिति के अनुसार उसका कोई हल निकाला जा सकता है, तो अच्छा होगा।

बहरहाल, एक कान्स्टीट्यूशनल फार्मेलिटी के तौर पर इस समय जो राष्ट्रपति जी ने घोषणा की है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ और इस में जो बान कही गई है वह कान्स्टीट्यूशन के अनुसार की गई है और गवर्नमेंट ने ठीक ही किया है।

श्री फ़रीदالحق अन्सारी : मस्तर

वॉन्स चैरमैन صاحب - ये रेपुब्लिकन जो हमारे मस्तर ऑफ़ स्तिट्युटिज्म में हैं, वे हैं, हमें कुछ बातें याद कराना हैं - सब से पहली बात ये याद कराना है कि ये गवर्नमेंट जो है बाल्कल ना अल है तज्जुबे से - कुछ सोचने में और इसी وجه से हमारे ऑनोबल मस्तर صاحب ने ये फ़रमाया कि हम को पछेहली बातें जो हो गयी हैं उन को बाल्कल

नज़र اندाज़ कर देना चाहिये। अस लगे में عرض करना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम किसी मुसल्ले के ओवर गोर करते हैं तो सिर्फ़ मौजूदा हालात को देखकर आप सचिब नहिजे नहिं नकल सकते हैं जब तक आप पछेहली वाक़ात और हालात पर नज़र नहिं डालें और जब तक मौजूदा हालात और वाक़ात पर नहिं रोशनी नहिं डालें और जब तक दुनोनों को मिला कर रोशनी नहिं डालें तब तक हम सचिब नहिजे पर नहिं पैदा हो सकते हैं - अस रेपुब्लिकन का ये नहिजे नकल है कि गवर्नमेंट जो है वो किसी बात को ख़ुद करने के लिये तैयार नहिं होती है जब तक कि ये मजबूर नहिं कहा जाना अस वक़्त तक वो कौनो चीज़ नहिं करती है - अस रेपुब्लिकन को पछेहली वाली जो गवर्नमेंट पारती है वो पहली पारती के लोकोन पर अपना हक़ लगे नहिं कर सकी है और पारती के लोक अस का हक़ मानने के लिये तैयार नहिं हैं -

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair].

श्री अक़्बर अली ख़ान : बाफ़ी तो सब जगह होते हैं -

श्री फ़रीदالحق अन्सारी : फ़ोर्मेरी

अक़्बर और तैय्यिब ने ये अन लोकोन को अस चीज़ से बाज़ नहिं रक्खा और पहली गवर्नमेंट से कान्ग्रेस से वो चले गئے, ये जो वाक़ा है अस से कौनो अन्कार नहिं

کر سکتا ہے۔ اصل میں میرے خیال میں ہندوستان میں ایک ایسی اسٹیٹ ہے جہاں تین بار پریزیڈنٹ کا رول ہو چکا ہے اور جہاں تین بار کنسٹی ٹیوشن فیمل ہو چکا ہے تو اس بات پر غور کرنا ضروری ہے۔ کہوں کہ سب سے بڑی جماعت جو ہے وہ کانگریس کی ہے اور اگر ہم کانگریس کے تمام کارناموں کو دیکھیں۔ میں کوئی نکتہ چسپی نہیں کر رہا ہوں۔ محض نکتہ چسپی کی وجہ سے میں نہیں کہتا چاہتا ہوں۔ لیکن مجھے دکھ ہوتا ہے کہ وہ جماعت جس نے آزادی کی جنگ میں اتنا بڑا حصہ لیا تھا جس نے آزادی کی جنگ میں کچھ اصول اپنے سامنے رکھے تھے۔ کچھ نظریہ اپنے سامنے رکھے تھے اس نے ان اصولوں اور نظریوں کو ہی نہیں دیا۔ بلکہ ان پر عمل ہی کیا لیکن آج ایک اسٹیٹ میں جب ان کو جو حکومت سونپی جاتی ہے تو یہ دیکھا جاتا ہے کہ وہ جماعت جو ایلی مضبوط پالیسیوں اور اپنے مضبوط مقاصد کے لئے اور نظریہ کے لئے مشہور تھی ان پر وہ نہیں چلتی بلکہ وہ پارٹی کو طاقت کو اپنے ہاتھ میں رکھنے کے لئے کوششیں کرتی ہے کہ وہار کی جو مختلف اقلیتیں ہیں ان کو ملا لیں اور ان کو ملا کر کے پارٹی اپنے ہاتھ میں رکھیں۔ اس وجہ سے بار بار یہ دیکھا جاتا ہے کہ چاہے وہ کانگریس ہو، چاہے وہ کمیونسٹ ہو۔

کمیونسٹوں کو بھی میں کہتا ہوں کہ جب بھی کوئی اپنے اصل سے ہٹ کر محض طاقت حاصل کرنے کے لئے دوسری جماعتوں کو جن سے ہمارے مقاصد بالکل مختلف ہیں، جن سے ہمارے مقاصد بالکل الگ ہیں، جو کہ ان اصولوں میں یقین نہیں رکھتیں جن میں کانگریس یا پی۔ ایس۔ پی یا ایس۔ ایس۔ پی یقین رکھتی ہے، جن کو وہ جماعتیں مانتی نہیں ہیں۔ ان کو جب بھی ساتھ لیا جائے گا تو ظاہر ہے کہ وہ اپنے موجودہ مقاصد کو حاصل کرنے کے لئے اپنا ذاتی فائدہ اٹھانے کے لئے ایلی ذات کے لئے کچھ فائدہ اٹھانے کے لئے وہ وفاداری جو ہے اس سے وہ ضرور ہٹ جائیں گی۔ چنانچہ یہاں بھی ہوا کہ کانگریس نے ہر طرح کے پریسیڈنٹ الیڈ کمیٹیشن استعمال کئے۔ ہر کمیٹیوں کے ساتھ انہوں نے مفاہمت کی، ہر کمیٹیوں کو انہوں نے ملایا اور نتیجہ اس کا جو ہوا وہ آج ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ آج پھر تیسروں بار وہی کنسٹی ٹیوشن ختم ہو گیا۔ پھر دوسری بات ہم یہ دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ ایک نیا گروپ کانگریس کا نکل آیا ہے۔ میں نے تو ایلی زندگی میں یہ سنا نہیں اور اب ایک نیا گروپ قسٹینٹ کانگریس۔ میں کا نکلا ہے۔ یہ محض کھول میں مضبوط نہیں ہے بلکہ ہندوستان کے اور صوبوں میں بھی دیکھا جاتا ہے کہ قسٹینٹ کانگریس میں نکل آئے ہیں اور اس کا اثر، جذبات وائس

[شری فریدالحق انصاری]

چیمبر میں صاحب - ہمارے صوبے میں ایسا خراب پورا ہوا ہے کہ اس کی وجہ سے تمام ایڈمنسٹریشن جو ہے اس کا ساتھ نہیں ہو رہا ہے - اس لئے میں نہایت ادب سے عرض کروں گا کہ اگر اس چیز کو دور کیا جائے تو کسی ذراہ کسی کمزوریت کے ساتھ کوئی خاص گروپ صرف پارور ہاتھ میں رکھنے کے لئے نہیں بنانا چاہیئے تب یہ ہماری جو ہے دور ہو سکتی ہے - چونکہ کانگریس کی کوئی مستقل آئینہ الدرجی نہیں تھی اسی وجہ سے مستحکم گورنمنٹ کھل میں کانگریس نہیں چلا سکی - کوئی بھی مستقل فائیکشن اور پالیسی نہیں - میں مثال کے طور پر بتاؤں کہ جب پی - ایس - پی کولیشن نے لفڈ ریمارم ایکٹ پاس کیا تو شلکر صاحب کی منسوری نے اس میں بعد میں ایسی ترمیمیں کیں کہ جو اس کا اصل مقصد تھا وہی بدل گیا - پھر حال یہ طریقہ کہ مختلف اقلیتوں کو ملا کر یہ مختلف خیمات کے لوگوں کو ملا کر کے حکومت بنانا پارور اچھا ہاتھ میں رکھنے کے لئے یہ بالکل غلط ہے -

جیسا کہ میں نے ابھی عرض کیا کہ کانگریس اور گھونست دونوں نے وہاں ہر طرح کا تجربہ کیا اپنی طاقت کو محفوظ رکھنے کے لئے - آپکو یاد ہوگا کہ وہاں ایک بار پی - ایس -

پی کی مالکوتی حکومت بنی - میرے معزز دوست پروفیسر مکت ہاری لعل کدستی تھوٹی کے ایکسپریٹ ہیں اور وہ بتا سکتے ہیں کہ کیا کبھی مالکوتی گورنمنٹ کبھی بنی - وہ گورنمنٹ جو بنی تھی وہ کانگریس کی سپورٹ سے بنی تھی اور آپ کو یاد ہوگا کہ بیچ ہی میں وہ حکومت ختم ہو گئی - وہ سے وہ حکومت بہت اچھی طرح سے چل رہی تھی - لوگوں کا اس پر اعتماد تھا اور اس کے زمانہ میں کرپشن ختم ہو گیا تھا - نیپوٹزم ختم ہو گیا تھا - مگر پھر کانگریس نے اپنی سپورٹ اس سے ہٹالی اور وہ گورنمنٹ گر گئی - پھر بعد میں کانگریس کی گورنمنٹ بنی - پھر اس کے بعد وہ گورنمنٹ ہٹی اور پریزیڈنٹ رول ہوا - پھر اس کے بعد گھونست رول ہوا اور گھونست حکومت کہ عوام نے ختم کیا - اس کے بعد پھر رول ہوا پریزیڈنٹ کا اور پھر کانگریس کی گورنمنٹ آئی - یہ گورنمنٹ اب جو آئی یہ کولیشن گورنمنٹ تھی اور چناؤ کے زمانہ میں سب نے مل کر کے چناؤ لیا تھا - ایک پلیمت فارم سے چناؤ لیا تھا - اب اس سے زیادہ اتحاد کا کیا نظارہ ہو سکتا تھا مگر معلوم یہ ہوا کہ یہ چونکہ جمہوریت کو مضبوط کرنے کے لئے نہیں تھا ، سیکولرزم کو مضبوط کرنے کے لئے نہیں تھا ، سوشلزم کو مضبوط کرنے کے لئے نہیں تھا ، اس لئے یہ بھی ختم ہوا - جو روپہ کانگریس

نے اختصار کیا وہ رویہ معاف کریں گے
مہرے کانگریس کے دوست اگر میں یہ
کہوں کہ وہ مذموم رویہ تھا جس کے
تحت اس کولیشن کو ختم کیا گیا -
ایک بھک جھسا مہرے دوست نے بتایا
کہ ایک روز صبح اخبار میں ہم لوگوں
نے دیکھا کہ جو ہمارے وہاں رہا تھا
مسٹر پیٹ تھانو ولے وہ گورنر بنا دئے
گئے - اپنی پارٹی کو ہاتھ میں رکھنے کے
لئے مہرے خصال میں یہ گاندھوں
طریقہ نہیں تھا - مہانما گاندھی بھی
اس اصول کو پسند نہ کرتے - مہانما
جی ہمیشہ کھلی ہاتھیں کرتے تھے
سچی باتیں کرتے تھے و ایمان
داری کی باتیں کرتے تھے اور اس
طرح سے توڑ جوڑ نہیں کرتے تھے -
مجھے تو سب سے زیادہ افسوس اس
بات کا ہے کہ مہرے ایک بہت ہی
عزز دوست اس معاملہ میں لپٹے
ہوئے تھے - انہوں نے اس کو سر کیا تو یہ
نتیجہ نکلتا ہے کہ یہ جو کچھ ہوا وہ
استاد کے کہنے کے مطابق ہے -

ع اے باد صبا اس ہمہ آوردہ تست

دلے ہوا جو کچھ بربادی ہے یہ تھری
ہی کی ہوئی ہے - یہ موجودہ
منسٹری جو گئی اس منسٹری کے
خلاف جھسا کہ کسی صاحب نے
فرمایا خود کانگریس کے لوگوں نے الزام
لگایا کریشن کا نہ پوتنم کا - چاہئے تو
یہ تھا کہ ان کے چارجز کی انکوائری

ہوتی اور اگر مہرے خصال میں انکوائری
ہوتی تو شاید یہ حکومت جو ہے وہ
نہ ہڈی اور ایک استیبلٹی ایک
استحکام اس حکومت میں آتا مگر
چونکہ یہاں بابائے حکومت نے انکار کر
دیا انکوائری سے اس لئے وہ کانگریس
میں جو 10 تھے انہوں نے ہٹ کر
اپوزیشن کا ساتھ دے دیا اور اس وجہ
سے وہ حکومت گر گئی - الزام صرف
وہیں نہیں بلکہ مہسور میں بھی
لگائے جا رہے ہیں، اریسہ میں بھی
لگائے جا رہے ہیں - لیکن معلوم نہیں
کہوں اس قدر پروپگنڈا کے باوجود کہ
کریشن ختم کیا جا رہا ہے اور اس
بات کا ڈھونگ کیا جا رہا ہے کہ
کریشن ختم کیا جائے اس کے متعلق
انکوائری نہیں ہوتی ہے - مجھے
افسوس یہ بھی ہوا دیکھ کر کہ ایک
ذمہ دار وزیر صاحب نے کہا کہ اگر اس
طرح سے انکوائری کی جائے گی تو لوگ
غلام چارجز لگائیں گے - میں
نہایت ادب سے کہتا ہوں کہ
انڈین پیپل کوٹ اور انڈین کرسٹل
پروموشن کوٹ میں اس بات کا کافی
پراویز ہے کہ اگر کوئی شخص
جھوٹے یا بے بنیاد الزام لگائے تو اس
کی سزا ہو سکتی ہے -

اب ہم یہ دیکھ رہے ہیں
کہ وہاں الیکشن آ رہے ہیں اور اس
لئے ہر بڑی پارٹی جو ہے وہ ہونا آئندہ
فرنٹ کا نعرہ دے رہی ہے - مہرے

[شری فریدالحق انصاری]

معزز دوست سلیمانی سہتو صاحب
نے الہ آباد سے اسٹیٹمنٹ دیا کہ
کانگریس مسلم لیگ سے الائنس کرنا
چاہتی ہے اور انہوں نے یہ بھی
کہا کہ ہم الائنس کے لئے بالکل تیار
نہیں ہیں اس لئے کہ کونسل
گورنمنٹ جو بنی تھی کانگریس، پی۔
ایس۔ پی اور مسلم لیگ کی اس
میں مسلم لیگ کے ساتھ نہایت
نازوا ہوتاؤ کانگریس نے کیا - تو
کانگریس بھی یہ چاہ رہی ہے ہونالٹیڈ
فرنٹ بنانا - مسلم لیگ سے یہ تو
پتہ چل گیا مگر اور لوگوں کا پتہ
نہیں چلتا ہے - کونسل جو وہیں
وہ بھی ایسا کرنے کی کوشش کر
رہے ہیں تو وہاں ایک بہت ہی
عجیب فضا ہے -

ہر بوالہوس نے حسن پرستی شعار کی
اب آپروئے شہوہ اہل نظر کئی

ہر شخص چاہتا ہے ہونالٹیڈ
فرنٹ قائم کرنا اور کام کے لئے اپنی
حکومت بنانے کے لئے - اس لئے
نہیں کہ جمہوریت کو مضبوط کیا
جائے اس لئے نہیں کہ کولنز کو
مضبوط کیا جائے اس لئے نہیں کہ
سوشلزم کو مضبوط کیا جائے بلکہ اس
لئے کہ حکومت کی باک دور
ہمارے ہاتھ میں رہے -

تو جلاب - میں تو صاف کہتا
چاہتا ہوں کہ کانگریس کا تو یہ
حال تھا اور کونسل بھانہوں نے
بھی جب حکومت کی تو ان کا
کہا حال تھا - اس کے بارے میں
مہرے عزیز دوست نے یہ دیا کہ
انہوں نے کس طرح سے حکومت
کی - انہوں نے اس بات کی کوشش
کی کہ یہاں اپوزیشن کو کسی طرح
سے ختم کر دو - ہماری پارٹی کے
پی - ایس - پی کے کئی آدمیوں
کو قتل کیا گیا پارٹی کے کئی
آدمیوں کو مارا گیا ان کو اسلٹ
کیا گیا - آپ کو یاد ہوگا شاید
انہوں نے بتایا بھی کہ وہاں اس
بات کی کوشش کی گئی - اس
میں ان کا قصور کچھ نہیں ہے
میں کہتا ہوں کہ ان کا ذاتی
قصور نہیں ہے یہ تو اصول کا قصور
ہے ان کا اصول ہی یہ ہے کہ جہاں
کونسل حکومت آئیگی وہاں
جمہوریت کا استعمال کریں گے
جمہوریت کو ختم کرنے کے لئے جہاں
کونسل حکومت آئیگی وہاں
سہکولزم کو ختم کریں گے اپنے
اپوزیشن کے لوگوں کو ختم کریں گے
اور اگر ویسے نہیں ختم ہو سکتے
تو بائی فورس ختم کئے جائیں گے -
چنانچہ یہی ہوا - پولیس میں ان
کے سہلس بلے ہوئے تھے پھوپس
کورٹس عدالتوں - بنی ہوئی تھیں -

فارسٹ لہند جو کہ گورنمنٹ کی
پراپرٹی ہے اس کو ایچ آدمیوں
میں بانٹا گیا۔ تو ان تجربوں کی
بلا پر ہم کیسے کہہ سکتے ہیں
کہ ہم ان کے ساتھ یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ
بنانے کے لئے تیار ہیں۔ اور صاحب
ان کی قیموکریمی کے متعلق تو
ہندوستان کے ایک جو بہت ہی
امپورٹینٹ جیورسٹ ہیں، مشہور
جیورسٹ ہیں، وہ کہتے ہیں -

“Democracy has been sought to be
made their chief preserve and with
their tongues in their cheeks they
talk about Peoples' Democracies
which in fact are ruled by ruthless
dictatorships. They try to put up a
facade of elections in which the
voter has no choice but to vote for
the only candidate put forward by
the Communist Party.”

تو میں نے عرض کیا کہ جمہوریت
کا تو یہ حال ہے۔ باقی جہاں
تک یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ کی بات ہے تو
یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ ان کا جو ہے اس
کا حال دنیا میں دیکھ لیا گیا ہے۔
جہاں جہاں یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ انہوں نے
بنایا وہاں وہاں جن پارٹیوں سے
یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ بنایا انہی پارٹیوں
کو پہلے ختم کیا اور ان کو ختم کر
کے اپنی گورنمنٹ بنائی۔ پولہند میں
یہ کیا چیکوسلواکیہ میں یہ کیا
اور یورپ کے جتنے ممالک ہیں جہاں
جہاں یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ قائم کیا وہاں
یہ کیا۔ چلتاچھوٹا یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ کا یہ
حال ہے اس کے بارے میں بھی

ذرا اس کو سنئے گا یہ بہت کی
تعجب خیز بات ہے :-

“The Communist writers of Kerala
have now issued an invitation to all
lovers of leftist ideas to form a Uni-
ted Front. In 1921 Lenin advised
the Communists of Great Britain to
'support the Labour Party as the
rope supported the man who is being
hanged'. An English Communist is
said to have translated this as 'mak-
ing them by the hand as a prelimi-
nary to taking them by the throat'.”

آئی کے۔ دامودرن : کیا پڑتے ہیں جی
آپ ؟

شری فریدالحق انصاری : جو
کتابیں رائٹرس کی ملتی ہیں وہی
پڑھتا ہوں، انہی باتوں کو کہتا ہوں -

آئی کے۔ دامودرن : ہندوستان کی
کامیونٹ پارٹی کی بات کہیے ۔

شری فریدالحق انصاری : ہندوستان
میں بھی یہی ہوگا۔ آپ کو موقعہ
نہیں ملا ہے -

میں یہ کہہ رہا تھا کہ کمیونسٹ
رول آئے گا تو جتنے راستے قیموکریمی
کو مضبوط کرنے کے ہیں وہ سب
بلد کو دیئے جائیں گے۔ اس لئے
میں کہتا ہوں کہ ہماری پارٹی
یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ نہ تو کانگریس سے
قائم کرے گی نہ کمیونسٹ پارٹی
سے کرے گی۔ ہم تو یہ یقین رکھتے
ہیں کہ -

دفتن بہ پائے مودی ہم سایہ در بہشت
حقا کہ با عقوبت دوزخ برابر است

[شری فریدالحق انصاری]

۴۴ پروسی کی مدد سے بہشت میں
بھی جانا دوزخ کے برابر ہے۔
ان کے ساتھ یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ قائم کر کے
کیا کریں گے۔ وہ حکومت بنائیں
گے تو یا تو ہم کو حکومت سے
نکالیں گے کہ تم جاؤ اور اگر نہیں
نکالیں گے تو جو ٹیکٹکس یورپ
میں کی ہیں وہی ہم سے کریں
گے۔ اس لئے ایس۔ ایس۔ پی تو
ان کے ساتھ یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ کبھی
قائم نہیں کرے گی۔ اب رہا
ایڈجسٹمنٹ کا سوال، تو ایڈجسٹمنٹ
کا کیا مطلب ہے۔ کیا ایڈجسٹمنٹ
کا یہ مطلب ہے کہ وہ کہیں کہ
یہاں ہماری ہی پارٹی مضبوط ہے
ہم کو یہاں کھڑا ہونے دیجئے۔ اس کا
فیصلہ کون کریگا۔ تو ہم اس کے
لئے بھی تیار نہیں ہوں گے۔

شری اکبر علی خاں۔ پی۔ ایس۔

پی اور کانگریس کی آئیندہالوجی
ایک ہی ہے۔

شری فریدالحق انصاری: یہ بھی

فطرت ہے۔ یہ میں نے بتایا۔

उप सभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद
भागवंत): पी० एस० पी० अब कहाँ है ?

شری فریدالحق انصاری: میں

آپ کو بتاؤں کہ یہ تو کھلے بندوں
ڈیموکریسی کو ختم کرنا چاہتے ہیں
اور وہ ڈیموکریسی کو خاموشی کے

ساتھ ختم کرنا چاہتے ہیں، وہ ایسے
کام کرتے ہیں جس سے کہ ڈیموکریسی
ختم ہو۔ آج کل ہندوستان میں
جو غلہ کی حالت ہے۔ آج کل ہندوستان
میں کھانے کی چیزوں کی جو حالت
ہے وہ بھی حالات ہے کہ اس سے
جلتا پریشان ہو کر یہ کہے کہ یہ
کس قسم کی ڈیموکریسی ہے اس
سے تو ڈکٹیٹر شپ اچھی ہے۔ تو
کانگریس کے لوگ اس طرح سے
جمہوریت کو ختم کرنا چاہتے ہیں۔

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY
(Mysore): May I ask one question?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SURI M. P.
BHARGAVA): He wants to ask one ques-
tion.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: I
am not prepared to yield to him. If
you are prepared to give me time, I
am prepared to yield to him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P.
BHARGAVA): What is your question?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY:
May I ask him whether my friend is
very sure of himself when he states
that this policy statement which he is
now making will be acceptable to the
party, S.S.P., that there will be no
adjustment or no united front in
Kerala?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY
(Mysore): It need not be answered.

شری فریدالحق انصاری: بلاب۔

میں یہاں ذمہ داری کے ساتھ باتیں
کر رہا ہوں، غور ذمہ داری کی باتیں
نہیں کر رہا ہوں۔ میں کوشش
کروں گا، انتہک کوشش کروں گا کہ

ان جماعتوں سے، ان پارٹیوں سے جن میں کانگریس بھی شامل ہے جو کہ نہ جمہوریت میں ایمانداری سے یقین رکھتے ہیں نہ سیکولرزم میں یقین رکھتے ہیں ان کے ساتھ یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ قائم نہ ہو - مودے دوست اگر یہ کہیں کہ جو کچھ جمشید پور اور روزکیلا اور اریسہ میں ہوا وہ سیکولرزم کے مطابق ہوا تو میں ان کے قدم چومنے کے لئے تیار ہوں - جے پرکاش جیسے آدمی نے یہ چارج لگایا ہے کہ اسٹیٹ اس کنسپیرسی میں شریک ہے - اس لئے میں کہتا ہوں کہ میں کسی کے ساتھ یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ قائم کرنے کو تیار نہیں ہوں - میں کسی کے ساتھ ایڈجسٹمنٹ کرنے کو تیار نہیں ہوں اس لئے کہ تجربہ نے یہ دکھایا ہے جو تین پریزیڈنٹس رول ہوئے ان میں دیکھا گیا کہ ہر پارٹی نے جہاں جہاں ہاچ پانچ طریقہ سے وقتی لحاظ سے جماعت بلائی، یونائیٹڈ فرنٹ قائم کیا وہاں وہاں آخر میں جا کر وہ ٹوٹ گیا - تو ایسی چیز کو بلانے سے کیا فائدہ جو بات تجربہ سکھاتا ہے اس کو نہیں سیکھیں مگر تو عدی کا ایک³ مقولہ کہنا ہی پڑے گا کہ وہ جو شخص تجربہ سے نہیں سیکھتا ہے اس کو ندامت ہوتی ہے ۴۴ -

اس لئے میں عرض کرتا ہوں کہ میری پارٹی تو اپنی پالیسی اپنے پروگرام کے اوپر الیکٹوریٹ کے سامنے جائے گی - اگر وہ ہم کو صحیح سمجھتے ہیں، ایمان دار سمجھتے ہیں، اگر دس مہینے کی حکومت کے جو کارنامے ہیں ان کو وہ ٹھیک سمجھتے ہیں، ان کو وہ سمجھتے ہیں کہ اصول کے مطابق ہوں تو وہ ہم کو چنوں گے -

عسر تسلیم خم ہے جو مزاج یار میں آئے نہیں تو ہم انتظار کریں گے تب تک جب تک جلتا سمجھ کی کہ یہ ایمانداری کے ساتھ جمہوریت کی، سیکولرزم کی، سوشلزم کی خدمت کرتے ہیں - ہمارے سامنے سوال ہے ملک کا کسی پارٹی کا کانگریس کا یا کمیونسٹ کا سوال نہیں ہے - ہم ملک کی خدمت کرنا چاہتے ہیں - ہم کانگریس کی خدمت کرنا نہیں چاہتے یا کمیونسٹ کی خدمت کرنا نہیں چاہتے - تھینک یو -

†[श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी :
मिस्टर वाइस चैयरमैन साहिब
यह रिजोलूशन जो हमारे मिनिस्टर ग्राफ स्टेट
साहिब ने यहां रखा है हमें कुछ बातें याद
कराता है । सब से पहली बात यह याद
कराता है कि यह हुकूमत जो है वह
बिल्कुल ना-अहल है तजुबे से, कुछ सीखने में ।
और इसी वजह से, हमारे आनरेबल मिनिस्टर
साहिब ने यह फरमाया कि हमको पिछली
बातें जो हो गयी हैं उनको बिल्कुल

नजर प्रन्दाज कर देना चाहिये। इसलिए मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम किसी मामले के ऊपर गौर करते हैं तो सिर्फ मौजूदा हालात को देखकर आप सही नतीजा नहीं निकाल सकते। जब तक आप पिछले वाक्यात और हालात पर नजर न डालें और मौजूदा हालात और वाक्यात पर भी रोशनी न डालें। और जब तक दोनों को मिलाकर रोशनी नहीं डालेंगे तब तक हम सही नतीजे पर नहीं पहुँच सकेंगे। इस रिजोलूशन का अगर यही नतीजा निकलता है तो हुकूमत जो है वो किसी बात को खुद करने के लिये तैयार नहीं होती है, जब तक कि उसे मजबूर नहीं किया जाता, उस वक़्त तक वो कोई चीज़ नहीं करती। इस रिजोलूशन को पेश करने वाली जो हुकूमरान पार्टी है वो अपनी पार्टी के लोगो पर अपना हुकम लागू नहीं कर सकती है और पार्टी के लोग उसका हुकम मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M P BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

श्री अकबर अली खान बागी तो सब जगह होते हैं।

श्री फरीदुलहक अन्सारी : डिसिप्लीनेरी एक्शन और थोट ने भी इन लोगो को उस चीज़ से बाज नहीं रखा और अपनी हुकूमत से, कांग्रेस में वो चले गये, यह जो वाक्या है इससे कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता है। अमल में मेरे खयाल में हिन्दुस्तान में एक यही स्टेट है जहाँ तीन बार प्रेजिडेंट का रुत हो चुका है और जहाँ तीन बार कस्टीडियन फेल हो चुका है, तो इस बात पर गौर करना जरूरी है क्योंकि सबसे बड़ी जमाअत जो है वो कांग्रेस की है और अगर हम कांग्रेस के नमाम कारनामों को देखें—मैं कोई नुक्ता-चीनी नहीं कर रहा हूँ मज़ नुक्ता-चीनी भी वजह में मैं नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ—लेकिन मुझे दुख होता है कि वो जमाअत जिसने

कि आज़ादी की जग में इनना बड़ा हिम्सा लिया था, जिम्मे आज़ादी की जग में कुछ उसूल अपने सामने रखे थे, कुछ नज़रिए अपने सामने रखे थे, उसने उन उसूलों और नज़रियों को ही नहीं रखा बल्कि उन पर अमल भी किया लेकिन आज एक स्टेट में जब उनको हुकूमत सौंपी जाती है तो यह देखा जाता है कि वो जमाअत जो अपनी मजबूत पोलिमियो और अपने मजबूत मकामद के लिए और नज़रिए के लिए मशहूर थी उन पर वो नहीं चलती बल्कि वो पावर को, ताकत को, अपने हाथ में रखने के लिए कोशिश यह करती है कि वहा की जो मुख्तलिफ़ अकलीयते हैं उनको मिला ले और उनको मिलाकर के पावर अपने हाथ में रखे। इसी वजह से बार-बार यह देखा जाता है कि चाहे वो कांग्रेस हो, चाहे वा कम्युनिस्ट हों—कम्युनिस्टों को मैं कहता हूँ कि जब भी कोई अपने उसूल से हटकर मज़ ताकत हासिल करने के लिए दूसरी जमाअतों को जिनसे हमारे मकामद बिल्कुल मुख्तलिफ़ है, जिनसे हमारे मकामद बिल्कुल उल्टे हैं, जो कि इन उसूलों में यकीन नहीं रखती जिनमें कांग्रेस या पी० एम० पी० या एस० एस० पी० यकीन रखती है, जिनको वो जमाअत मानती नहीं हैं—उनको जब भी साथ लिया जाएगा तो जाहिर है कि वो अपने मौजूदा मकामद को हासिल करने के लिए अपना जाती फायदा उठाने के लिए, अपनी जान के लिए, कुछ फायदा उठाने के लिए, बफादारी जा है उससे वां जरूर हट जाएगी। चुनावों यहाँ यही हुआ कि कांग्रेस ने हर तरह के परस्पेटेशन एंड कम्बीनेशन इस्तेमाल किए। हर कम्युनिटी के साथ उन्होंने मफाहमत की, हर कम्युनिटी को उन्होंने मिलाया और नतीजा उसका जो हुआ वो आज हम देख रहे हैं कि आज फिर तीसरी बार वहा कास्टीडियन खत्म हो गया। फिर दूसरी बात हम यह देख रहे हैं कि एक नया ग्रुप कांग्रेस वा निकल आया है। मैंने तो अपनी जिन्दगी में यह सुना नहीं और अब

एक नया ग्रुप डिमिडेट काग्रेसमैन का निकला है। यह महज केरल में मखसुम नहीं है बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान के और सूबों में भी देखा जाता है कि डिमिडेट काग्रेस में निकल आए हैं और उसका अमर जनाब वाइस चैयरमैन महिब, हमारे सूबे में ऐसा खगब पड़ रहा है कि उसकी वजह से तमाम एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन जो है उसका मन्यानाश हो रहा है। इसलिए मैं निहायत अदब में अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर इस चीज को रोकना है तो किसी जान, किसी कम्पुनिटी के साथ कोई खास ग्रुप सिर्फ पावर हाथ में रखने के लिए नहीं बनाना चाहिए, तब यह बिमारी जो है दूर हो सकती है। चूंकि काग्रेस की कोई मुस्तकिल आड्डानाजी नहीं थी, इसी वजह से मुस्तहकम गवर्नमेंट केरल में काग्रेस नहीं चला सकी। कोई भी मुस्तकिल डाइरेक्शन और पोलिसी नहीं। मैं मिसाल के तौर पर बताऊ कि जब पी० एम० पी० कोलीशन ने लैंड रिफॉर्म एक्ट पास किया तो शंकर साहिब की मिनिस्ट्री ने उसमें बाद में ऐसी तरमीमें का कि जो उसका असल मकसद था वही बदल गया। बहरहाल यह तरीका कि मुख्तलिफ अवल्लियनों को मिलाकर के, मुख्तलिफ ख्यान के लोगों को मिला कर के, हुकूमत बनाना गवर अपने हाथ में रखने के लिए यह बिल्कुन ही गलत है।

जैसा कि मैंने अभी अर्ज किया कि काग्रेस और कम्मुनिस्ट दोनों ने वहां हर तरह का तर्जुबा किया अपनी ताकत को महफूज रखने के लिए। आपको याद होगा कि वहां एक बार पी० एस० पी० की माइनोरिटी हुकूमत बनी। मेरे मुअज्जिज दोस्त प्रो० मुकुट बिहारी-लाल कांस्टीट्यूशन के एक्सपर्ट हैं और वो वना सकते हैं कि क्या कहीं माइनोरिटी गवर्नमेंट कभी बनी? वह गवर्नमेंट जो बनी थी वह काग्रेस की सपोर्ट से बनी थी। और आपको याद भी होगा कि बीच ही में वो हुकूमत खत्म हो गयी। वैसे वो हुकूमत बहुत अच्छी तरह से चल रही थी। लोगों का उम पर एतमाद था और उसके जमाने में कर्प्शन

खत्म हो गया था, नेपोटिज्म खत्म हो गया था। मगर फिर काग्रेस ने अपनी सपोर्ट उससे हटा ली और वह गवर्नमेंट गिर गयी। फिर बाद में काग्रेस की गवर्नमेंट बनी। फिर उसका बाद वो गवर्नमेंट हटो और प्रेजिडेंट इट्स्म हुआ। फिर उसके बाद कम्मुनिस्ट रूल हुआ और कम्मुनिस्ट हुकूमत का अव्वाम ने खत्म किया। इसके बाद फिर रूल हुआ प्रेजिडेंट का और फिर काग्रेस को गवर्नमेंट आई। यह गवर्नमेंट अब जो आई यह कोलीशन गवर्नमेंट थी। और चुनाव के जमाने में सबने मिलकर के चुनाव लड़ा था, एक प्लेटफॉर्म से चुनाव लड़ा था, अब उससे ज्यादा इन्तिहाद का क्या नजारा हो सकता था मगर मालूम यह हुआ कि यह चूंकि जमहूरियत को मजबूत करने के लिए दह था। मैक्गलरईज्म को मजबूत करने के लिए नहीं था, मोश-लिज्म को मजबूत करने के लिए नहीं था, इसलिए यह भी खत्म हुआ। जो रवैया काग्रेस ने इस्तिन्यार किया वह रवैया, माफ करेंगे मेरे काग्रेस के दोस्त, अगर मैं यह कहू कि वो मजबूत रवैया था, जिसके जमूनहत इस कोलीशन को खत्म किया गया। यकबयक जैसा मेरे दोस्त ने बताया कि एक रोज सुबह अखबार में हम लोगों ने देखा कि जो हमारे वहां गहनुमा थे मि० पट्टम थानु पिल्ले वो गवर्नर बना दिए गए। अपनी पावर को हाथ में रखने के लिए, मेरे ख्याल में, यह गांधियन तरीका नहीं था। महात्मा गांधी भी इस उसूल को पसन्द न करते। महात्माजी हमेशा खुली बाने कहते थे, मच्ची बात करते थे, ईमानदारी की बाने करते थे और इस तरह से तोड़ जोड़ नहीं करते थे। मुझे तो सबसे ज्यादा अफसोस इस बात का है कि मेरे एक बहुत ही अजीज दोस्त इस मामले में लिपटे हुए थे। उन्होंने इसको सर किया तो यह नतीजा निकलता है कि यह जो कुछ हुआ वो उस्ताद के कहने के मुताबिक है। ऐ बाद सवा ईन हमारा आवुर्दा-ए-नुस्न "एह हवा यह जो कुछ बर्बादी है यह तेरी ही की हुई है।" यह मौजदा मिनिस्ट्री जो गयी उस मिनिस्ट्री के खिलाफ जैसा कि

[श्री फ़रीदुल हक़ अन्सारी]

किसी साहिब ने फरमाया खद कांग्रेस के लोगों ने इल्जाम लगाया करप्शन का, नेपोटिज्म का । चाहिए तो यह था कि उनके चार्जिज की इन्क्वायरी होती और अगर मेरे खयाल में इन्क्वायरी होती तो शायद यह हुकूमत जो है वो न हटती और एक स्टेटिलीटी, एक इस्तहकाम इस हुकूमत में आता मगर चूँकि यहाँ बाबाए हुकूमत ने इन्कार कर दिया इन्क्वायरी से, इसलिए वे कांग्रेस में जो १५ थे उन्होंने हट कर अपोजीशन का साथ दे दिया और इस वजह से वह हुकूमत गिर गयी । इल्जाम सिर्फ वही नहीं बल्कि मैसूर में भी लगाए जा रहे हैं, उड़ीसा में भी लगाए जा रहे हैं, लेकिन मालूम नहीं क्यों डम कदर प्रोपेगंडा के वावजूद कि करप्शन खत्म किया जा रहा है और इस बात का ढोंग किया जा रहा है कि करप्शन खत्म किया जाए इसके मुतलिक इन्क्वायरी नहीं होती है । मुझे अफसोस यह भी हुआ देख कर कि एक जिम्मेदार वज़ीर साहिब ने कहा कि अगर इस तरह से इन्क्वायरी की जाएगी तो लोग गलत चार्जिज लगाएंगे और मैं निहायत अदब से कहता हूँ कि इंडियन पीनल कोड और इंडियन क्रिमिनल प्रोसीजर कोड में इस बात का काफ़ी प्रोवोजन है कि अगर कोई शख्स झूठे या बेबुनियाद इल्जाम लगाए तो उसको मजा हो सकती है ।

अब हम यह देख ही रहे हैं कि वहाँ इलेक्शन आ रहे हैं और इसलिए हल बड़ी पार्टी जो है वो यूनाइटेड फ्रंट का नारा दे रही है । मेरे मुअजिज दोस्त सुलेमान सेठ साहिब ने इलाहाबाद से स्टेटमेंट दिया कि कांग्रेस मुस्लिम लीग से एलाएस करना चाहती है और उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि हम एलाएस के लिए बिलकुल तैयार नहीं हैं इसलिए कि कोलीशन गवर्नमेंट जो बनी थी कांग्रेस पी० एस० पी० और मुस्लिम लीग की उसमें मुस्लिम लीग के साथ निहायत

नारवा बर्ताव कांग्रेस ने किया तो कांग्रेस भी यह चाह रही है यूनाइटेड फ्रंट बनाना । मुस्लिम लीग से यह तो पता चल गया मगर और लोगों का पता नहीं चलता है । कम्युनिस्ट जो हैं वो भी ऐसा करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं तो वहाँ एक बहुत ही अजीब फिजा है ।

हर बुलहवस ने हुस्न परस्ती शआर की, अब आबुए शेवा-ए-अहले नजर गयी ।

हर शख्स चाहता है यूनाइटेड फ्रंट कायम करना और काहे के लिए ? अपनी हुकूमत बनाने के लिए । इसलिए नहीं कि जम्हूरियत को मजबूत किया जाये इसलिए नहीं कि सैक्यूलरीज्म को मजबूत किया जाए, इसलिए नहीं कि सोशलज्म को मजबूत किया जाए, बल्कि इसलिए कि हुकूमत की बागडोर हमारे हाथ में रहे ।

तो जनाब, मैं तो साफ़ कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस का तो यह हाल था और कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों ने भी जब हुकूमत की तो उनका क्या हाल था, इसके बारे में मेरे अजीज दोस्त ने यह बताया कि उन्होंने किस तरह से हुकूमत की । उन्होंने इस बात की कोशिश की कि यहाँ अपोजीशन को किसी तरह से खत्म कर दो । हमारी पार्टी के पी० एस० पी० के कई आदमियों को कत्ल किया गया, पार्टी के कई आदमियों को मारा गया, उनको एसाल्ट किया गया । आपको याद होगा कि शायद उन्होंने बताया भी कि वहाँ इस बात की कोशिश की गयी । इसमें उनका कुसूर कुछ नहीं है । मैं कहता हूँ कि उनका जाती कुसूर नहीं है, यह तो उसूल का कुसूर है उनका उसूल ही यह है कि जहाँ कम्युनिस्ट हुकूमत आयेगी वहाँ जम्हूरियत का इस्तेमाल करेंगे जम्हूरियत को खत्म

करने के लिए, जहां कम्युनिस्ट हुकूमत आएगी वहां सैक्यूलरीज्म को खत्म करेंगे, अपने अपोजीशन के लोगों को खत्म करेंगे, और अगर वैसे नहीं खत्म हो सकते तो बाई-फोर्स खत्म किए जाएंगे। चुनावों के लिए यही हुआ। पुलिस में उनके सैल्स बने हुए थे, पीपल्स कोर्ट्स—अदालतें—बनी हुई थीं। फोरेस्ट लैंड जो कि गवर्नमेंट की प्रापरटी है उसको अपने आदमियों में बांटा गया। तो उन तजुबों की बिना पर हम कैसे कह सकते हैं कि हम उनके साथ यूनाइटेड फ्रंट बनाने के लिए तैयार हैं। और साहिब, उनकी डेमोक्रेसी के मुत्तल्लिक तो हिन्दुस्तान के एक जो बहुत ही इम्पोर्टेंट जूरिस्ट है, मशहूर जूरिस्ट हैं वो कहते हैं :

“Democracy has been sought to be made their chief preserve and with their tongues in their cheeks they talk about People's Democracies which in fact are ruled by ruthless dictatorship. They try to put up a facade of elections in which the voter has no choice but to vote for the only candidate put forward by the Communist Party.”

तो मैं ने यह अर्थ किया कि जनहुरियत का तो यह हाल है। बाकी जहां तक यूनाइटेड फ्रंट की बात है तो यूनाइटेड फ्रंट उनका जो है उसका हाल दुनिया में देख लिया गया है। जहां जहां यूनाइटेड फ्रंट उन्होंने नायाब वहां वहां जिन पार्टियों ने यूनाइटेड फ्रंट बनाया उन्हीं पार्टियों को पहले खत्म किया और उनको खत्म करके अपनी गवर्नमेंट बनायी। पोलैंड में यह किया, चेकोस्लोवाकिया में यह किया और यूरप के जितने ममालक हैं जहां जहां यूनाइटेड फ्रंट कायम किया वहां यह किया। चुनावों के यूनाइटेड फ्रंट का यह हाल है, उसके बारे में भी जरा इस क सुनिश्चा, यह बहुत ही ताज्जुब-खेज वा है—

“The Communist writers of Kerala have now issued an invitation to all lovers of leftist ideas to form a United Front. In 1921 Lenin advised the Communists of Great Britain to ‘support the Labour Party as the rope supported the man who is being hanged’. An English Communist is said to have translated this as ‘making them by the hand as a preliminary to taking them by the throat.’”

श्री के० दामोदरन् : क्या पढ़ते हैं जी आप ?

श्री फरीदुलहक अन्सारी : जो किताबें राइटर्स को मिलनी हैं वही पढ़ता हूँ, उन्हीं बातों को कहता हूँ।

श्री के० दामोदरन् : हिन्दुस्तान की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की बात कहिए।

श्री फरीदुलहक अन्सारी : हिन्दुस्तान में भी यही होगा, आपको मौका नहीं मिला है।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि कम्युनिस्ट रूल आएगा तो जितने रास्ते डेमोक्रेसी को मजबूत करने के हैं वो सब बन्द कर दिये जायेंगे। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारी पार्टी यूनाइटेड फ्रंट न तो कांग्रेस से कायम करेगी न कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से करेगी। हम तो यह यकीन रखते हैं कि—

रफतन बा पाये मदीहमसाया दर बहिश्त
हका के वा उकूबत दोख बराबर अस्त।

पडोसी की मदद में बहिश्त में भी जाना दोख के बराबर है।” उनके साथ यूनाइटेड फ्रंट कायम करके क्या करेंगे ? वो हुकूमत बनायेंगे तो या तो हमको हुकूमत से निकालेंगे कि तुम जाओ और अगर नहीं निकालेंगे तो जो टेक्टिक्स यूरप में की हैं वो ही हमसे करेंगे। इसलिए एस० एस० पी० तो उनके साथ यूनाइटेड फ्रंट कभी कायम नहीं करेगी। अब रहा एडजेस्टमेंट का सवाल तो एड-

[श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी]

जस्टमेंट का क्या मतलब है। क्या एडजस्टमेंट का यह मतलब है कि वो कहे कि यहां हमारी ही पार्टी मजबूत है, हमको वहां खड़ा होने दीजिए। इसका फैसला कौन करेगा? तो हम इसके लिये भी तैयार नहीं होंगे।

श्री अकबर अली खान : पी० एस० पी० और कांग्रेस की आइडोलोजी एक ही है।

श्री फरीदुलहक अन्सारी : यह भी गलत है। यह मैंने बताया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : पी० एस० पी० अब कहा है?

श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी : मैं आपको बताऊ कि यह तो खुले बन्दो डेमोक्रेसी को खत्म करना चाहते हैं और वो डेमोक्रेसी को खामोशी के साथ खत्म करना चाहते हैं वो ऐसे काम करते हैं जिससे कि डेमोक्रेसी खत्म हो। आजकल हिन्दुस्तान में जो गल्ले की हालत है, आजकल हिन्दुस्तान में खाने की चीजों की जो हालत है वह यही हालत है कि उससे जनता परेशान होकर यह कहे कि यह किस किस की डेमोक्रेसी है, इससे तो डिक्टेटरशिप अच्छी है। तो कांग्रेस के लोग इस तरह से जमहूरियत को खत्म करना चाहते हैं।

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): May I ask one question?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): He wants to ask one question.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: I am not prepared to yield to him. If you are prepared to give me time, I am prepared to yield to him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): What is your question?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: May I ask him whether my friend is

very sure of himself when he states that this policy statement which he is now making will be acceptable to the party, S.S.P., that there will be no adjustment or no united front in Kerala?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): It need not be answered.

श्री फरीदुल हक अन्सारी : जनाब, मैं यहां जिम्मेदारी के साथ बातें कर रहा हूँ। गैर-जिम्मेदारी की बातें नहीं कर रहा हूँ। मैं कोशिश करूंगा, अनथक कोशिश करूंगा कि इन जमायतों से, इन पार्टियों से जिनमें कांग्रेस भी शामिल है, जो कि ना जमहूरियत में ईमानदारी से यकीन रखते हैं ना सैक्यूलर-इज्म में यकीन रखते हैं, उनके साथ यूनाइटेड फ्रंट कायम न हो। मेरे दोस्त अगर यह कहें कि जो कुछ जमशेदपुर और राउरकेला और उड़ीसा में हुआ वह सैक्यूलरीज्म के मुताबिक हुआ तो मैं उनके कदम चूमने के लिए तैयार हूँ। जयप्रकाश जैसे आदमी ने यह चार्ज लगाया है कि स्टेट इस कांस्प्रेसी में शरीक है। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि मैं किसी के साथ यूनाइटेड फ्रंट कायम करने को तैयार नहीं हूँ, मैं किसी के साथ एडजस्टमेंट करने को तैयार नहीं हूँ, इसलिए कि तजुबों ने यह दिखाया है, जो तीन प्रेजिडेंट्स रूल्स हुए उनमें देखा गया कि हर पार्टी ने जहाँ-जहाँ हाँच-पौच तरीके से, वक्ती लिहाज से, जमायत बनाई, यूनाइटेड फ्रंट कायम किया, वह-वहा आखिर में जाकर वह टूट गया। तो ऐसी चीज को बनाने से क्या फायदा? जो बात तजुर्बा सिखाता है उसको नहीं सीखेंगे तो अरबी का एक मकूल कहता ही पड़ेगा कि "जो शख्स तजुर्बों से नहीं सीखता है उसको नदामत होती है।"

इसलिए मैं अर्ज करता हूँ कि मेरी पार्टी तो अपनी पोलिसी, अपने प्रोग्राम के ऊपर इलेक्टोरेट के मामले जाएगी। अगर वो हमको सही समझते हैं, ईमानदार समझते

हैं, अगर हमारी दस महीने की हुकूमत के जो कारनामे हैं उनको वो ठीक समझते हैं, उनको वो समझते हैं कि ऊमूल के मुताबिक हैं, तो वो हमको चुनेंगे।

सरे तस्लीम खम है जो मिजाजे यार मे आए।

नहीं तो हम इन्तजार करेंगे तब तक जब तक जनता समझेगी कि यह ईमानदारी के साथ जमहूरियत की, सैक्यूलरइज्म की, सोशलिज्म की, खिदमत करते हैं। हमारे मामले मवाल है मुल्क का, किसी पार्टी का, कांग्रेस का या कम्युनिस्ट का मवाल नहीं है। हम मुल्क की खिदमत करना चाहते हैं। हम कांग्रेस की खिदमत करना नहीं चाहते या कम्युनिस्ट की खिदमत करना नहीं चाहते।

थैंक यू।

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL (Delhi) Sir, you will agree with me that if the Home Minister deserved any congratulation from this House, it could not have been expressed better than by the type of arguments and the type of debate that has been presented to him by the opposition. I think, without saying it, from the fact that they have not been able to find anything to attack him or his Government they have confessed that the Congress and the Home Ministry have taken the very right step and have shown its boldness that notwithstanding the fact that the party in power in Kerala was Congress, when the process of democracy failed, they have come to the House and to Parliament to proclaim the rule of the President. No party in power can deserve a better compliment than this that while enforcing the Constitution, while obeying the law of the land, they do not care whether the party in power in Kerala was Congress or someone else, for which I am proud that Congress not only deserves to be congratulated but it is a pride to belong to the Congress. I have been following the speech of one of the great and leading Members

of this House, Mr. Ansari, and all the time Mr. Ansari was speaking, I was wondering what school of thought he was representing. He has his life full of sacrifice, he has suffered for the country, he has given a lot when the freedom fight was going on. We all respect him for it. But the type of thesis that he has propounded today that out of unity, out of synthesis, only chaos follows, I have been unable to follow. I do not know whether Mr. Faridul Haq Ansari represents a new philosophy of his party or not. He has said that he is not going to compromise with anybody, that he is not going to make adjustments with anybody, that he is not going to fall in line with anybody, that he is not going to believe in the order of the day. Perhaps, his socialism is getting very close to anarchism, and I am afraid, ultimately when this theory develops, whether that stage will not come when the SSP in this country becomes the main propounder of the theory of anarchism. I shall leave it at that because I am certain that the past record of the party, whether in its present form or in the previous form, in Kerala particularly, has not been such as will get them any votes. He has accused us and the Congress for what happened to Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai. I should not like to comment upon it but if their own leader leaves them, they cannot accuse us, they cannot blame us for it.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: We have said that the way in which Lal Bahadurji did it was not justified.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Is it justified?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The tragedy is that both Nehruism and Gandhism are taught to us by those . . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Normal decency and parliamentary practice demand it.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Normal decent practice demands that those who be-

[Shri I. K. Gujral.]
long to one party should stick to it and not leave it. But their past record we like to recognise because gubernatorial jobs are not offered to Congressmen alone.

PROF. M. B. LAL: I feel that a person who deserts a political party does not deserve to be a Governor.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: When did Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai leave? When was he appointed as Governor of Punjab? How many hours . . .

(Interruptions)

PROF. M. B. LAL: The moment a person leaves his party, deserts his party, he disfigures his old record.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I for one will have no objection if a rule is made here that anyone who leaves his party shall be considered a renegade and possibly if that rule is laid down, my friend, Mr. Faridul Haq Ansari, and the revered Professor here will be in an awkward position.

PROF. M. B. LAL: I have not left any party. We have integrated the two parties into the SSP.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I do not know. Whether he is joining or leaving . . .

(Interruptions)

PROF. M. B. LAL: We did it with the unanimous consent of the conference of our party.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh): How many times has this process been followed?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The main point indeed is that we have proved our *bona fides* that in appointing Governors or in offering any high office we are not bound down by party loyal-

ties; we look for talent everywhere. And the main point also is that we do not want to teach the parties of the Opposition the ethics of belonging to a party. We do not want to tell our friends in the Communist Party that they should not divide themselves. We also do not want to give a lecture to the Professor and to Mr. Faridul Haq Ansari that while merging they should see that their leaders do not leave them. I do not like to take upon myself (Interruptions) the responsibility of telling anybody what he should do in his own party. But it is good for the healthy growth of democracy if some ethics of party politics were evolved. And it was because of this, you will agree, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that when those 12 or 15 renegades left the Congress Party in Kerala itself, we did not woo them. We left the Government rather than compromise with them. We refused to woo them, we refused to compromise with them, we refused to be blackmailed by them.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Then why did Mr. S. K. Patil go there?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Mr. S. K. Patil went there merely to assess the situation and to advise the Congress High Command that when 12 or 15 renegades have left, we should not compromise with them, with the situation.

AN. HON. MEMBER: You are mistaken.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: You will agree with me, Sir, that in the present set-up of things, if democracy has to survive, it must be understood, as the Congress has rightly understood, that renegades are not to be compromised with at any cost and this ethics of party politics I should like to commend to my friends on the other side of the House as well because it will help them.

PROF. M. B. LAL: If the Congress had followed this policy, it would have been much better.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am glad that my remarks about the ethics of party politics have aroused some reaction because it was lacking, and up till now I was feeling that it was merely a shadow-boxing that was going on. I am glad that now there is some life in the debate and we are talking about something.

My friend in the Jana Sangh, Mr. Chordia, a very eloquent, lovable and beautiful speaker, has tried to tell us that communalism is bad, that we should not compromise with it. We shall keep it in mind. But I wish he had given this medicine to his own party also. He has also tried to tell us that the unitary form of Government is better than the federal form of Government as is being practised here. We have all sworn by the Constitution as practised here and I would tell Mr. Chordia that this attempt at talking of a unitary form of Government makes us sometimes suspicious that the real programme is unification of a very different type, based on a different order of society; this makes us more suspicious, and I would rather that while he was giving the medicine of non-communalism and abhorring communalism, he would also have told us that his party had more faith in democracy, in the decentralised form of democracy, because democracy which is not practised from Panchayati Raj right up to Parliament fails in its own purpose.

Now, I wish to address myself with your permission, Sir, to that crest-fallen, dejected, frustrated Communist Party. I am sorry that Mr. Govindan Nair has been trying to analyse about the instability in his State and he has tried to give us some causes. And the main cause that he could possibly find was the existence of communalism. I absolutely agree with him that communalism in any shape or form is bad, whether it is in Kerala or in Madhya Pradesh or anywhere, in any part of the country. And communalism in any corner, from any community, is not only bad for demo-

cracy, it is bad for this country. On this I have absolutely no dispute with Mr. Govindan Nair. But I hope that those of his friends who have left him recently, Mr. Namboodripad and others, will also keep it in mind and will not try to compromise with them as it is being said that they are trying to arrive at a compromise with the communal parties in order to win the elections. I am sorry that no one as yet, at least from that wing of the Communist Party, has spoken and I would have been glad if they had before I have spoken so that I would have addressed myself more on that point. Mr. Govindan Nair said something about them but Mr. Govindan Nair has no authority to speak on their behalf.

(Interruptions)

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: He is correct.

PROF. M. B. LAL: They are in the left.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sir, it is a misfortune and here I speak with feeling and with sympathy that the history of the Communist Party from Telengana to Tenali has been a very sordid one and a sad one. It is a sad one because it is the sum total of confused thinking about the Communist line and the sum total of blunders. I sometimes try to imagine that if any argument was needed that dogma negates thinking, it is this one. If the Communists of this country—and here I have to confess this—they constitute among the adherents some of the most intelligent people in this country who have sacrificed considerably in their past, were not so much wedded to the dogmas of left or right, perhaps the shape of things would have been different. But unfortunately, this tragedy is not national, it is an international tragedy. It is an international tragedy of a system, of a belief, of a god, that has failed. It has failed not only the Communists and the Communist Party, it has failed many more.

[Shri I. K. Gujral]
In its sunshine it had inspired everybody. It inspired people to sacrifice. It inspired people to give away everything. It inspired people to lay down their lives. I have come from that part of the country where I have known Communists sacrificing everything when they were fighting the British. Not only did that happen, they appealed to the intellectuals, and in appealing to the intellectuals they inspired a generation of painters in as far countries as Mexico and others of the standing of Siquiros, Riviera and Orozco. And even Picasso could not be left uninfluenced. Writers like Howard Fast could not remain untouched. And nearer home it produced Faiz and Jaffri. And, Sir, when that intellectual growth was going on, tragedy took place. The tragedy was that Stalin followed Lenin and Mao became the great priest of Marx. It is that tragedy, Sir, which has let every one down.

Sir, sometimes I want to imagine an Asia in which Maoism had not existed. You imagine if Mao were not dominating China today, if Tibet had not been swallowed up, if India had not been attacked, if South-East Asia's independence had not been endangered, what a mighty Asia would have risen today. It is there where Communism and the Communist Party of this part of the country and of the world have not only let down themselves, they have let down the freedom movement, they have let down the anti-imperialist forces, they have let down all those who stood for progress, who stood for prosperity. It is a tragedy that has let down not only this part of the world but the future thinking and the forward-looking of the world has been let down. Imagine, Sir, what would have been the fate of this country and of the world if Stalin had not succeeded Lenin, and the shape democracy as a force in the world would have taken, and what an intellectual upsurge the world would have witnessed if this tragedy had not been enacted. But theirs is the fate of the

legendary god—Prometheus—who having given the fire to the world, has now been nailed to the rock by his own followers; vultures of Maoism are eating them up. My attention goes to them because this international attitude manifests itself again and again in the national situation and in Kerala itself. It is a tragedy of the divided Communist Party, it is a tragedy of the confused schizophrenic thinking, if I may return the compliment, of the 'split personality' of the Communist Party which is letting it down today. Kerala will emerge as a symbol of democracy because Kerala's past is glorious. Kerala's history is glorious.

If I may remind you, Sir, it fought the Portuguese aggression for 100 years, and threw Albuquerque out of this country. Kerala's past is that great past of Shankra Acharya which has produced even today the highest percentage of educated people. Sir, I am not one of those who are pessimistic about the future of Kerala. I am very hopeful, hopeful because the population there is well-educated, hopeful because the people there are so intelligent, hopeful because the people there love democracy. Sometimes they may have committed a mistake. But I am sure the next election will make them realise that the mistakes of the last ten years are amply remedied and they will not be victims of divided loyalty. Today, when the Communist Party is divided, today when the S.S.P. has nothing to offer them, Congress has a future to offer them in the form of a stable democracy, Congress has a future to offer them in the form of socialism. Congress has a future to offer them in the form of democracy, socialism and secularism put together which will take not only Kerala forward but which will take the country forward.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, just now we have heard the funeral oration at the fall of the Congress Ministry in Kerala by my hon. friend,

Mr. Gujral, who represents the capital city of Delhi. I have great respect for him, and I can say that he has done it very well.

Sir, as you know, Kerala is the smallest but the most enlightened State of our country. Now it is under the President's rule. This was inevitable because of the conditions that prevailed at the time of the fall of the Congress Ministry in Kerala. I only wish that this President's rule will last for a very short time and the forthcoming elections which are to take place in February 1965 will give a stable and good Government to the people of Kerala.

Sir, different views have been expressed here by hon. Members belonging to different parties, and there is a feeling that a stable Government under the present democratic set-up is not possible in Kerala. But I have to say and say it very strongly that today if there is no stable Government in Kerala, it is not the fault of the democratic set-up, it is not the fault of the people of Kerala, it is not the fault of the different parties that exist in Kerala, but it is solely and only the fault of the Congress Party that has been all this time most dishonest and most insincere and which failed to give to the Kerala people an honest and stable Government.

Sir, as you are aware, Congress has had many occasions when it had a comfortable majority in the State Legislature, but because of factions amongst themselves, because of the groupism amongst themselves, and because of the petty quarrels in which they indulged, they undermined the vital interest of the Kerala State and fought amongst themselves. Thus the Congress failed to give the country and the State of Kerala a good and stable Government.

Now you all know, Sir, what happened during the last mid-term elections of 1960. Who was voted to power? It was not the Congress. I

can say that very boldly and without fear of contradiction that the Government which was voted to power in the 1960 election was not the Congress; it was the Democratic Alliance that was voted to power, the democratic alliance consisting of the Congress, the P.S.P. and the Muslim League. This was the party that was voted to power. And what did the Congress do after coming to power? It let down the Muslim League first, then it dropped the P.S.P. later, and the result was bitterness, confusion and instability. In these circumstances, to blame the people of Kerala is sheer nonsense. It is, therefore, the Congress and Congress alone that is responsible for all this instability and all this under-development in the State of Kerala.

Sir, as I just now told you, the happenings in Kerala, after the 1960 mid-term elections, are a sad story. That was the worst sort of political betrayal ever witnessed in the history of this country. As you all know, the Congress joined with the Muslim League and the P.S.P. and thus secured a very comfortable majority in the legislature to give to the State of Kerala a very stable Government then. But the same Muslim League which was declared to be a national party by the leaders of the Congress during elections suddenly changed into a communal party after they had gained a comfortable majority in the Assembly. Let me say that the character of any political party, its definition of being national or communal, does not depend on the whims and fancies of the ruling party.

Recently, on the 15th of this month, replying to questions in the Lok Sabha, the Deputy Minister of Home Affairs pointed out that it is not at all possible to describe what communalism is and he also said that no political party in India is communal. Then how can you call the Muslim League a communal party? It is the declaration of the Government of India. The Minister said that, not I.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Will you read out what the Minister said, and has it the authority of the Constitution?

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Yes. He is a Minister of the Government of India and therefore an authority. Mr. Jaganath Rao, the Deputy Minister for Home Affairs, told the questioner that the Government did not consider any political party as communal. So there is no political party which is communal, according to the Government. Moreover, as far as the Muslim League is concerned, it is a minority organisation and therefore a national organisation. It does not stand for domination, it only wants to safeguard the rights of the minorities as guaranteed by the Constitution, and according to the Constitution, every minority has the right to organise itself to protect its rights and liberties. So we are doing it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: On the basis of religion?

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: As a minority and every minority has the right to do it. Then, later on, the Muslim League, even after being let down, was prepared, even without coming to the Government, to give it unconditional support.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Why did you join the Government?

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: We did not ask for it. The Congress leaders themselves declared at a public meeting that when we are fighting together, we will rule together. It was said by Mr. S. K. Patil and it was Mr. Chacko, the late Home Minister, who said later 'We are fighting together and we will rule together'. It was they who betrayed the Muslim League later on. Even when the Muslim League was not taken into the cabinet the League leaders said, in the interest of stability of the State and development of the State, that we

would give unconditional support to the Congress-PSP coalition in Kerala. Later on what happened? There was an alliance between the P.S.P. and the Congress and it continued for some time. In the last Parliamentary elections, in 1962, the Congress and the P.S.P. divided the seats among themselves—leaving alone Muslim League—14 for the Congress and 4 for the P.S.P. But the result was that the P.S.P. lost all the 4 Parliamentary seats and the Congress got six out of 14. This is how people of Kerala expressed their disapproval of the Congress attitude. The P.S.P. was also dropped later on. First we were dropped and later on the P.S.P. also was dropped.

Sir, Kerala is called a problem State. It is not really a problem State. Here in North India we find that we have tension among the different communities in some parts. There is no such tension at all in Kerala. What Gandhiji had dreamt of and what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, our late Prime Minister, worked for was realised in Kerala because after this democratic alliance of Congress, P.S.P. and the Muslim League, there was unique unity between Hindus and Muslims in Kerala and what spectacle we had in Kerala you cannot see anywhere here. Therefore the Congress acted against their promises and pledges and betrayed the Muslim League. They actually shattered the dreams of Gandhiji and the work of Panditji which was there in Kerala in the form of Hindu-Muslim unity. Therefore I say this instability which is in existence in Kerala now is not the creation of anybody else. Let us not blame the people of Kerala. I say to Congressmen: You must not have come for an alliance with the Muslim League, if you considered it communal. If you had come into an alliance, then you must have completed the full term with that alliance, otherwise you must have resigned after coming into power with the support and co-operation of the Muslim League when you broke the sacred pledge. You did neither.

You did not do both and you blame others. Is it sensible and just, you can consider yourselves? As you all remember—I will go back a little—it was the great Pandit Nehru, our late Prime Minister, who said in those days that it was highly desirable that a Muslim Leaguer should become the Speaker. What did you do after the first Speaker died? You refused to act on the words of the great Prime Minister. The ex-President of the Congress, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, went to Kerala and worked out the alliance with the Muslim League. The present Prime Minister of India, Shri Lal Bahadur, worked out the division of seats and yet you say that there was no alliance. It is really strange which no sane person can understand. We have to realise the fact and acknowledge the same that the Congress has failed in Kerala and thus failed the country. Therefore I feel that the Congress will come to better senses and I also hope that we will have very fair and free elections in Kerala, in the forthcoming elections, and thus we will be able to have a stable Government.

Lastly, I would speak only one word and that is about the food situation in the State to which I should draw the attention of the Government. In Kerala the food situation is getting from bad to worse. The people are not getting rice and the conditions prevailing are 'near-famine' conditions. The price for a bag of rice has gone up from Rs 40 to Rs 100. I hope the Government will take this into consideration and see that rice is rushed there to save the poor people so that they may get rice in plenty and thus not die of starvation.

SHRIMATI DEVAKI GOPIDAS: I stand here to support the motion moved. As a Member representing the Kerala State and especially as a Member from the Congress Party, with a feeling of distress of course I will have to speak on this occasion. It is for the third time that the President's Rule is invoked in Kerala. I have been

hearing the speeches made by my friends on the other side. Shri Govindan Nair was telling us that the Communist Party was ruling all right and its rule was ended arbitrarily by the Centre. In fact Mr Mathen has narrated how the Communists were ruling there. In fact we all know and we all had the privilege of suffering under the Communists' rule there. We know how they ruled, how they were frightening the people and amassing wealth for the Members of the Communist Party and for the Party alone. I would like to narrate an incident in which I myself was involved. One day during the Communist rule, when there was no police protection or law and order, while I was travelling alone in a taxi with my little son, one man of a Communist Party Jatha stopped the car even though there was enough space on the road and he threw a lighted bidi on the face of my son. Anyway without any further molestation, I could escape from there because some people came to my rescue at that time. That was the sort of rule we were having. It was the popular upsurge that was there from one end of the State to the other that overthrew the Communist rule. Shri Nair will remember the one slogan that was sung by the people at that time from one end to the other. It meant 'This Government is not ours' and that was a slogan that was raised from one end of the Kerala State to the other and the people as a whole found that the Party was ruling for the Party and not for the downtrodden people that they professed.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Now we hear some people say that there is some communalism there. Of course I would say that communalism is there not only in Kerala but it is everywhere. It is in the Communist Party, in the SSP and in any party. They also have got communalism, but in Kerala, I would like to endorse the views expressed by Mr Sait, all the communal parties live together amicably without any enmity between

[Shrimati Devaki Gopidas.]

them. In fact we are allowed and we are having inter-caste marriages 3 P.M. without any social stigma attached to them, and it is continuing in our State, but I would like to mention at this juncture that there is communalism because there are four main communal parties, I mean there are four main communities there with communal tinge attached to them and they have their own organisations. It has an economic basis too. There is poverty there; there are not enough jobs; there is educated unemployment, and because of these reasons, to effectively bargain for the loaves and fishes of office, they formed themselves into different organisations, and it is because of that we find communalism more rampant, communal feelings are aroused; it is because the country has not developed adequately, the development schemes in Kerala have not progressed as fast as they deserve to be. That is why we find that communalism is there, and it is there due to economic factors and economic factors alone. We find that in Kerala State the percentage of literacy is much higher than in almost every other part of the country. It has a good climate and nature is bountiful there. Still it is a poor State incapable of running a stable Government of its own. It is a fact that from time immemorial Keralites used to adorn, with integrity and capacity, very high positions outside the State. In spite of this, up to this time, we have proved to be a failure internally. Then where lies the malady? We will have to pause and think. There I would like to say—I have said it already—that the malady lies in the educated unemployment, in the educated idle man-power. And that is there to create trouble. Those youngsters who now come out from the colleges and universities find that they do not get jobs, and because they have no job to do and earn their bread, they consider it a hobby to go and join the Communist Party, and because they find that in the Congress Party there

are old veterans and they cannot have leadership there, thinking on these lines they go and join the Communist Party, not that they are convinced about the party's programme or their ideology; just as a hobby they do like that. Another point I would like to mention here is that there is a section of the people, the intelligentsia so to say, who are very careful and highly conscious of their rights and privileges. They are very critical of the acts of Government and of the representatives in the Legislature and in Parliament; they assess their actions by the result; they assess what is going on in the Legislature or in Parliament, and in the Government; they are always critical. It is on this group of the population that the fate of the State depends. They are vigilant and highly critical of all the actions of the Government. But they are prepared to vote for the party who, they believe, is capable of solving the acute problems of the State, especially economic problems and the problem of unemployment. This we have to solve and this is the root cause of all the trouble there. Only that party, or an able party Government that can solve all these problems, that party alone can form a stable Government in Kerala. In spite of the bounty of Nature we find there is still much poverty in our State, and it is because of so much population there. For an area of about 15,000 square miles the population, according to the 1961 Census, is 169 lakhs, and thus the density of population in the State is very high. Added to the problem of density of population is the problem of unemployment. In about 100 people, 28 are self-employed, 6 partially employed, and the rest 66 are completely unemployed, of whom 46 are educated unemployed. This is the position there and it is the unemployed people, those who have not got any paying job to do, it is they who are creating the trouble there. So I would like to emphasise that, if the Government here is vigilant, if they care more for the State's problems, for the development of the State, then only

these problems can be solved. At this juncture I would like to say what Kerala has achieved from all these three Plans. When about a thousand crores of rupees were spent in the Central sector, the problem State of Kerala received only seventy-five lakhs of rupees, which is an investment in the form of a D.D.T. factory. We were promised a Heavy Electricals, but ultimately it went to Bhopal. Then we were hearing about the setting up of a Phyto-chemical factory and a shipyard for such a long time, of which the former is shelved, and I do not know the fate of the latter. It is rumoured that wire-pullings are going on in the direction of Goa. According to Dr. Lokanathan, unless and until heavy industries with employment potentiality are started in Kerala, the case of Kerala is doomed. Regarding power, we have many natural facilities; hydro resources are there. Still, for three or four months in the year Kerala is deficit in power and it has to depend on Madras for power and it has to close all its factories for four months of the year due to power shortage in summer. Due to that factories running on electricity could not run throughout the year. We find that the State Government is the main job-supplier, but then they cannot meet the demand in the absence of further projects coming up. After all it is limited. So what I would like to again say is that the problems of Kerala are not so much political nor communal, but mainly economic. Even though everybody says that there is communism there, I would like to say that it is more due to economic reasons that the problems arise. I can bring in more points to show how the people of Kerala feel, and how they are always disgruntled and frustrated, and that is why they are always dabbling in politics and are seeing that no such Government lasts long. Let me take food subsidy; in that also the people in Kerala feel that Kerala is discriminated against; they find that Central assistance is not uniform. When Orissa, Assam and Kashmir got 66-2/3 per cent., Kerala State, a chronic deficit

area in food crops but the best dollar-earning State, got only 50 per cent. On a *per capita* basis public sector outlay during the First Plan in Kerala came to Rs. 32.2 only when the all-India share was Rs. 55, and in the Second Plan, again it is considerably behind the all-India figure; it is Rs. 64 while the all-India figure is Rs. 118. Unemployment is most rampant in our State and I would request the Central Government to be more vigilant about the development schemes in Kerala and to establish more heavy industries there. We find, as now, that when the Plans are being formulated, there is no Government there; it always happens that during the period of the formulation of Plans the President is ruling, and because of that there is nobody to bargain for the allocations to Kerala. So I would request the President who has taken the reins of the Kerala Government to see that enough projects are given and enough allocations are made to Kerala, that the development schemes come up rapidly so that all the problems arising out of unemployment are solved. Then only we can expect to get a stable Government there. Then regarding the food position there I would like to say a few words. It is a State where we are having so much of cash crops. We are having rubber, pepper, ginger, cardamom and tea, which we export and earn dollars for the benefit of the whole country. But the foodgrains produced there are sufficient only for six months of the year, and for the remaining six months of the year we have to depend on other parts of the country. We find now that the food situation in Kerala is very grave and the people have to stand in queues for hours and hours together. I would like to present here a photograph that has come in one of the local papers showing a mother and child standing in a queue for hours together. It is a pitiable sight, the mother standing with the crying child and such pictures are coming out in almost all the papers. So many people are waiting and waiting for hours and there is even the looting of shops

[Shrimati Devaki Gopidas.]
in Kerala. So I would request the Government to see that in this deficit area enough stocks are maintained throughout the year. It is a chronically deficit area. Only by taking enough care of the progress of the economic condition of the people and about the development schemes can we get a stable Government there. As it is, only the Central Government can deliver the goods. The State Government did not do it because the State Government could not do anything. It is a poor State and it has not got any of the amounts needed for investment in industries. Because of all these factors, only the Centre can deliver the goods, as I said, and solve the problems of Kerala State. I would like to reiterate that it is not a political or communal problem, but it is an economic problem and only when this problem is solved can we expect to have a stable Government in Kerala. If democracy is to prosper there, if democracy is to work there, the Centre must be much more vigilant and it must give much more consideration for the Kerala State.

SHRI K. K. SHAH (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, instead of going into the history of the past twelve years, I would only analyse the present position. I was very carefully listening to the remarks of my hon. friend from the Opposition in order to find out why all these parties, the Muslim League, the S.S.P. and the Communists, all combined to overthrow the Congress Government there.

PROF. M. B. LAL: What about the Congressmen?

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Let us find it out. I am coming to that. Please bear with me for a little while, because this is a problem which deserves even your close attention. Let us take the speech of the hon. Member, Shri Sulaiman Sait. What did he say? He said that a minority has the right to have a party and that minority party has also the right to overthrow the party in

power. But to do what? He has been telling us that in the next elections there will be a Government with a comfortable majority. But will it have the same attitude as the Muslim League? Will it have the same attitude as the S.S.P.? Will it have the same attitude as the Communist Party? My hon. friend, Mr. Nair, was very eloquent and he said that the Congress has been taking shelter or taking the help of the communal parties. What did you do in the last elections? When the voting took place, with whom did you work together? (Interruptions) There are always two sides, my dear friend. Don't see only one side, if you want the truth.

AN HON. MEMBER: Please address the Chair.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: I am addressing the Chair, of course. But my hon. friend, Mr. Nair, came before my eyes and so sometimes my attention is drawn there.

My hon. friend, Shri Faridul Haq Ansari, says "We shall never cooperate with any party" and still he hopes to have a stable Government there. If he rules out alliances in a democratic set-up, where there are numerous parties, no government can ever function. Mr. Ansari, therefore, I hope will revise his stand. If he is not going to have alliances, why did he have an alliance for overthrowing the Congress Government there?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You kidnapped his leader.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: I do not want to be involved in all that now. May I remind my hon. friend, Mr. Nair, about the last four elections. Let him examine those elections in Kerala and tell us why he accommodated a member of the Muslim League in fighting the elections and in voting? Did you not get their votes and get their candidate elected?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Where?

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Ask your party. We have met each other in the elections and we know.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: But say where.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Mr. Nair will admit that it is true. I am not trying to apportion blame. Everybody is experimenting and while experimenting let us learn a lesson. What happened in 1957? I propose to analyse the position and I propose also to give a reply to Shri Sulaiman Sait. If you like, I shall do that first.

After the Communist Party was entrusted with power, they accepted them, maybe as an experiment, I am prepared to admit that. They thought that that Party would give a good account of itself. But unluckily their record was not good. If their record was good, then they would not have got 29 seats whereas they had obtained 67 in 1957.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: If you will please yield, I will explain.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: That is how the position stood

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: You should know that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But, Mr. Nair, he is not yielding.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: You count the number of seats. Don't you know that we got in 1957, 23 lakh votes and in 1960 against the combined opposition, we got 35 lakh votes?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One million votes.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: There also I am prepared to satisfy you. Your calculations are not correct.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They are the Election Commission's calculations.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him explain now.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: You published a pamphlet on that, but I leave that aside. Let us come to this point. Let us see what happened before 1957. I want to give my friends who have been saying that the Congress has no done well some figures and give them the number of seats secured by each party from 1952. In 1952, out of 108 the Congress got 44. At that time nobody had said that seats were allotted over the head of the Congress. There was an upsurge in their favour and they got 44 out of 108. In the next elections we got 40 seats and in the elections after that we got 45 seats. Therefore, if anybody says that Kerala is not a problem State, I cannot agree with him. I am sorry to say that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the biggest problem for you.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: The indication to the real problem has come from the mouth of Shri Sulaiman Sait. The Muslim League Party has been playing with every party there, trying to change the fortunes of each party. Let each party which believes in democracy take a lesson from what Shri Sulaiman Sait has said and also examine the figures of votes secured by the Muslim League. When they sided with the Communist Party, that party got more seats. When they sided with some other party, that party got more seats. It may be five or six seats, because there are different pockets and those pockets sometimes sway the fortunes of a candidate. I was amazed and surprised to hear from the mouth of Shri Sulaiman Sait today that there will be a stable Government in 1965. On what basis will it be? Will it be on the basis of the Muslim League being in the majority? I say it is going to remain a problem State all throughout unless better methods are found out. Unless the Muslim League is wiped out, the Kerala problem is not going to be settled.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: He asks why the Congress had an alliance with the Muslim League.

3807 *Resolution re Pro-* [RAJYA
clamation issued by

SHRI K K SHAH After the Communist Party went out of power—I agree with my friend entirely there—there was a democratic upsurge and in a weak moment Shri Sulaiman Sait's party joined the democratic upsurge

SHRI K DAMODARAN At that time there was no communalism?

SHRI K K SHAH In their weaker moment they did it. Having realised that the Communist rule was the worst, it was felt by the Muslim League that

SHRI K DAMODARAN Even communalism then became better?

SHRI K K SHAH I am not making allegations. I am only giving the facts. I am sure everyone in this House will agree with me that the Muslim League having realised the position, having had the taste of what happened during the Communist regime, made up its mind that it was better to fall in line with the democratic upsurge, so that they might have at least some more security than what they had under the Communist Government. That is why they joined the upsurge and when that upsurge took place, there was no alliance and this upsurge exploded into a mass movement. The Congress was not in the forefront when this upsurge against the Communist Party exploded. There were some others and the Congress joined subsequently. I am sure my hon friend, Mr Gupta, will agree with me that the Congress joined subsequently. (Interruptions) I have heard you, Mr Sait, and you will hear me patiently. The time has come when a better understanding of the situation in Kerala is necessary and those who are here should think in those terms.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Your patrons hold shares in the economic pro-

SABHA] the President in relation to the State of Kerala

duction field and you do the same in the political

SHRI K K SHAH When that upsurge took place, everybody knows that the Congress joined it subsequently. The Communist did not succeed and it was, in the interest of every party, even the communally-minded Muslim League, to see that what they had done should not be upset by a mistake and that is why a semblance of alliance appeared. It was in fact an anxiety on the part of everybody who had upset the Communist rule and, therefore, it was wrong on the part of Mr Sulaiman Sait to have said those things. The Congress tried its best to honour that understanding but not at the cost of principles. You talk of Mr Thanu Pillai. If the PSP and the SP could merge together or have an alliance or an electoral alliance with other parties for fighting the Congress, what is wrong if we have an understanding with the PSP and if Mr Thanu Pillai, even though leading a minority party, becomes Chief Minister twice? Look at the efforts made by the Congress in Kerala. In 1954 we were in a large majority and they had hardly a few seats and yet Mr Thanu Pillai became the Chief Minister. Having become the Chief Minister of a coalition Government, if the man had worked well, what is wrong if he is promoted?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Promoted?

SHRI K K SHAH What is wrong with that? Assuming for the sake of argument that we are not able to pull on together . . .

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI Very nicely promoted

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA You kidnapped him

SHRI K K SHAH Not like the Communist Party which, after coming into power, throttles everybody, have a cell . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You never took Mr. Asoka Mehta. You kidnaped Mr. Thanu Pillai . . .

SHRI K. K. SHAH: He was the head of the Party, not Mr Mehta. Mr. Mehta was here. You must appreciate that for a period of two years and for a period of one year the second time a minority was allowed to have a Chief Minister and we tried to toe the line to the extent possible because we knew that Kerala was a problem State. Examine the figures from 1952, for 1954, 1957 and 1960. It is not one election and you will see what happens in 1965. It is the Muslim League which has been swaying the votes. Have you no share? Has not the Communist Party any share in that? What happened in 1954? I will tell you. I know it much better because in every election we have been there. You know how the selection of candidates takes place. Why do you forget that? You have an alliance with somebody or an understanding with somebody.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Who had?

SHRI K. K. SHAH: The PSP had an understanding and you had an understanding. This is how selections took place and the elections were fought. (Interruption from Shri Sulaiman Sait). You and I know each other. Do you want me to tell everything here?

SHRI A. D. MANI: On a point of information. Has he joined the Congress?

SHRI K. K. SHAH: After hearing my speech, he is re-thinking.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: This is the shape of things to come. This is because of the coming elections.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: I do not mind whichever party the Muslim League joins. Let it merge with the SSP, let it join the Communist Party. I do not mind. It is only when the Muslim League will decide to join one or the

other of the democratic parties that Kerala will have a stable Government and the sooner the Muslim League makes up its mind the better. If they find the Congress is not good, let them join the S.S.P. If they find the S.S.P. is not good, let them join the Communists. Let them join some party. It will be good for the Party. It will be good for Kerala and the democratic spirit and the secular spirit will grow, develop and flower in Kerala and Kerala will point the way for better understanding for the whole of the country. Therefore, I hope, Mr. Sulaiman Sait, after going back to Kerala, will tell his Partymen that the days of the Muslim League are over. The day of Congress accepted, this country accepted secularism, to revive the slogan of religion is to put a dagger into the back of this country. Having made an experiment and after experimenting, if somebody finds that it has not been in the interests of the country, it is a mistake, what is wrong with it? After the experiments, one corrects oneself. What is wrong with it? But, who is responsible for these experiments? May I ask my Communist friends that question? I am pleading, I am not finding fault with them, but I am pleading with them. If you had done well during the time you were in power, probably there would have been two parties, the Communist and the Democratic Party. You revived the Muslim League.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: No.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Let us now forget all these things. Let us, from this day onwards realise what is going to happen in Kerala. It is true in Kerala there are four communities, not three. In Kerala we have got Christian with a network of about three thousand schools. I do not grudge that. We have got the Nairs with a network of probably the same number of schools. Then, our Communist friends are very powerful and they have also a network of schools and Mr. Sulaiman Sait and his Party are also trying to catch up. Not only there are these

[Shri K. K. Shah.]

communal educational institutions but see how many children of the other communities take lessons in the schools run by another community in Kerala. Let us examine this. We have got to find some solution for this. You can blame me and I can blame you. Everything has two sides and it will not pay. I do not say that what has been done in Kerala is not arguable. I am prepared to concede that what is happening in Kerala and what has happened there during the last two years is arguable but that does not solve the problem. The crux of the problem is this: Ours is a country that is wedded to secularism and in that country there is an enclave where communal forces are evenly matched, eighteen per cent. twenty-one per cent., twenty-three per cent., twenty-seven per cent. Now how are we going to solve the problem of this State? The only way therefore is for all parties believing in democracy to make up their minds and say, 'come what may, we shall not either ask for the support of, or do anything directly or indirectly which will encourage, communal parties.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is interesting to hear it from you now.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Why interesting? You have just played the game. Who has tabled the no-confidence motion? Here my friend Mr. Ansari says, 'we shall never come to terms with any party' and therefore everytime he will go on moving a no-confidence motion without caring to be in power or without any expectation of coming into power. Mr. Sulaiman Sait gets up in this House and says it was because the Congress could not carry out an understanding. It was not any understanding; it was a mass upsurge where everybody's idea was to see that the communists did not succeed. That was a common cause. But at the back of his mind is this idea, 'you give me my share, the share to a communal organisation. Then only I shall allow you to remain in power; otherwise I shall pull you down'. And you became a

party to it. Think quietly about this. Does it not come to that? If you play that game, there will be no solution in Kerala. Therefore I take this opportunity to appeal to you. You may find fault on a number of points with the Congress Government. They could have remained as caretaker Government for two or three months; but no; they came here and said, 'we have lost the majority'. My friend, Mr. Nair, was asking, 'as soon as you came to know that 15 members . . .

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: Not Mr. Nair; it was Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Yes; my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta asked.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Constitutionally.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: That is not the constitutional position. I beg to differ from you, Mr. Gupta. His contention is that as soon as fifteen members gave the Governor to understand that they were not going to support the Congress Party, it was the duty of the Congress Party to resign.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You did not hear what I said.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: No; because there was no other party in opposition to rule Kerala. The S.S.P. and other parties would think twice. We have seen in the Lok Sabha 70 or 80 people getting up in favour of a no-confidence motion but when the motion is moved ultimately we find only 50 or so getting up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Suppose 300 got up.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is running out, Mr. Shah.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: Therefore my request to the opposition members is this. If they make up their minds, 'we shall not do anything whereby the fortune of a party will be swayed by a party which believes in communalism

and depends on religion' then alone Kerala's problem will be solved It is true and I entirely agree that economically Kerala should be looked after much better I have no doubt whatsoever about it. My communist friends will forgive me when I say that their two years' rule did not give confidence to the people to start industries in Kerala.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA How do you say that?

SHRI K K SHAH If things had been different, it would have been much better Madam, I support the Motion

شری عبدالغنی (پنجاب) : میڈم

دہشتی حیدر - مدھی شرمندگی ہے کہ ایوزیہن نے کانگریس سوکار کو گرانے کے بعد اپنی سوکار نہیں بنائی - اس کا کارن صرف ایک ہے کہ دنیا میں مذاہب اور ازم یہ تو آئے تھے اس لئے کہ انسان کی بھلائی ہو دہش کی بھلائی ہو لیکن بدقسمتی سے ان ازموں کو ان دہشوں کو اس طرح سے بنا لیا گیا کہ سوائے ایک دہشوں کے کوئی دہش ایسا ہے ہی نہیں جو انسان کی بھلائی کر سکے یا دہش یا سوکار کا وہ مالک بن سکے - آخر یہ جتنے ازم ہیں، سوائے وہ ایس - ایس - پی ہو، کمیونسٹ پارٹی ہو یا کوئی دہی پارٹی ہو وہ دعویٰ تو یہی کرتے ہیں کہ ہم دہش کی بھلائی چاہتے ہیں تو پھر یہ دن دیکھتے کہوں نصیب ہوئے کہ کیرل میں کانگریس کی اکثریت کے

ناوجود وہاں ریاستیتی کے رول لاگو کرنا پڑا - جہاں میں شرمندہ ہوں وہاں میرا یقین ہے کہ کانگریس والے بھائی بھی اگر اپنے گریباں میں منہ ڈالیں چاہے وہ شاہ صاحب ہوں یا کوئی اور ہو، تو ان کو بھی ضرور اپنی ندامت کا احساس ہوگا -

آخر قصہ کیا تھا، میڈم - قصہ ایسا تھا کہ کیرل میں ایک چیف منسٹر جس کے خلاف کئی طرح کے الزامات تھے - - - وہ غلط بھی ہو سکتے ہیں مجھے اس سے بحث نہیں - - - ان کے اپنے ساتھی یہاں آئے اور انہوں نے آکر کہا کہ اس کی انکوائری ہو - پلذت حی ے یہ فرمایا کہ میں نے دیکھ لیا اس میں کوئی پرائیویسی نہیں ہے - بالکل یہ وہی تھا کہ جو پنجاب میں ہوا - کچھ کانگریس بھائی اس لئے کانگریس کو چھوڑ کر نہیں چلے گئے کہ ان کو کانگریس کے مقاصد سے یا کانگریس کے اصولوں سے یا کانگریس کی سرگرمیوں سے کوئی آپس میں اختلاف نہ تھا بلکہ وہ ایمانداری سے یہ محسوس کرتے تھے کہ پنجاب کے چیف منسٹر کو کانگریس کے خداوند ناجائز طور پر بنا دے رہے ہیں اور وہ تسہیلت کھلائے - لیکن جونہی اسے ایس - آر داس کا فیصلہ آیا ان کانگریسیوں نے دلیل ہو کر بھی منہ سے کانگریس

[عمری عبدالغنی]

میں شریک ہونا منظور کیا ہے یہ
کہول کے بھائیوں کو شکایت تھی
کہ شکر صاحب کانگریس کے بڑے پد
کے قابل نہیں وہ چھف منسٹر کے
پد کے قابل نہیں لیکن یہاں اس
بات کو کانگریس نے قبول کیا کہ
وہاں قیموگریسی ختم ہو اس بات
کو قبول کیا کہ ان کی ذلت ہو
لیکن اس بات کو قبول نہیں کیا
کہ وہ پلندہ بھائی جو ان کے ساتھی
تھے مگر وہ شاید شاستری جی کا
حکم نہ ماننے والے ہوں تو ایک
ایسا ریلھجن کہ جس نے دنیا میں
خدا کو ماننے والوں کو اور نہ ماننے
والوں کو ہندو کہا اور پریم کا سبق
دیا۔ بتوں کی پوجا کرنے والے اور
بتوں کا کہلتن کرنے والے دونوں کو
پریم کہا اور کوئی جھگڑا نہیں کیا
آج وہ کانگریس جو گاندھی جی کی
کانگریس کہلاتی تھی اس کی حالت
یہ ہو گئی ہے کہ شکر دھنا چاہیڈ
کہونکہ وہ شاستری جی کا بلند ہے
یا وہ نلندہ جی کا بلند ہے یا وہ
کسی اور کا بلند ہے اور ان پلندہ
بھائیوں کی بات نہیں سنی گئی۔
تو کانگریس کیوں مستحرم نہیں ہے۔
مجھے شرم ہے کہ ہم منہم پروگرام
پر اتفاق نہ کر سکے۔ اے گاہ۔
یہ کہ کیرل میں بھی کوئی چونو عمری
دیوی لال ہوتا اے گاہ۔ کہ کہول

میں آجاریہ کرپلا کی روح کام
کرتی اور سب سال کر یہ سوچتے
کہ ہم کم سے کم اس پروگرام پر
کہول کی خدمت کر سکتے ہیں۔
یہ میں مانتا ہوں لیکن کانگریس
بچائی جائے تو وہ بچے کی نہیں
وہ کہوں نہیں بچے کی اس لئے
کہ کرپٹ آدمیوں کے خلاف ان کے اندر
سے کئی بھائی ہوں اور مہرا دعویٰ
ہے کہ آج بھی اگر پارلیمینٹ میں
دونوں ہاؤسوں میں ایوزیشن اور ان
بھلچوں پر نگاہ لی جائے۔ ایوزیشن
کے لہندوں اور جو منسٹرس ہوں
ان پر نگاہ کی جائے تو ایوزیشن
میں زیادہ وہ لوگ ہیں جنہوں
نے ان منسٹروں سے اور ان بھلچوں
پر بھلنے والوں سے کہیں زیادہ
دیہی کے لئے قربانی دی ہے اور
جنہوں نے گاندھی جی کا ان سے
کہیں زیادہ ساتھ دیا ہے لیکن ان
میں کیا ہوا۔ ان میں ایک گدی
سے پریم جو ہے جو لالچ ان میں پیدا
ہو گیا ہے اس نے ان کو پروشان کر
رکھا ہے کہ کس کروپ کا اور کس
گت کا آدمی ہے۔ مجھے صدمہ ہے
اس بات کا کہ دیہی کا کہا ہونے
جا رہا ہے کہونکہ سہلتر ہو یا کوئی
ستھت ہو وہاں کانگریس کے اندر جو
سازشیں چل رہی ہیں وہ ملک
کو کہاں لے جائیں گی میں نہیں
جانتا لیکن مہرا یقین ہے کہ کانگریس
اکلی بار طاقت میں نہیں آنے والی

ہے - لیکن کیا کھول کی تاریخ پھر
سے ایوزیشن دہرائے گی - اس کا مقصد
تو ہے کہ ایوزیشن والے جہت کر
ہار نہ جائیں -

اس لئے جہاں میں کانگریس
والے بھائیوں سے کہتا ہوں کہ اس
کو سوچئے وہاں دوسروں سے بھی
یہی کہتا ہوں - آپ کہتے ہیں اس
پر کانگریس کو بدھائی دن کہ انہوں
نے بالکل صحیح قدم اٹھایا کہ انہوں
نے راستہ پرستی رول لاگو کیا - انہوں
یہ بالکل غلط ہے - اگر آپ ۱۵ بھائیوں
کو راضی نہیں کر پاتے تھے تو کم
سے کم ان کو طاقت ہی دے دیتے
ان سے کہہ دیتے کہ تم ہی اپنی
طرف سے کام چلاؤ - یہ کوئی گندی
کی بات تو نہیں تھی مقصد یہ
تھا کہ کھول کی خدمت ہو - تو
ایوزیشن کے بھائیوں سے بھی یہی
کہتا ہوں کہ کانگریس سرکار کو نکمی
ہو چکی ہے، کھوکھلی ہو چکی ہے
چاہے شاہ صاحب کتنے ہی زور سے
کہیں، چاہے گجراں صاحب کتنے
زور سے کہیں، یہ عمارت تو قائم
رہنے والی نہیں ہے، لیکن کہیں
ایسا نہ ہو کہ اس سے کرنے سے
دھیس کر جائے - آج یہ تو ماندا
چاہئے کہ کانگریس سرکار کے گرانے
سے اگر دیس کر جائے تو دیس کی
یہ کوئی خدمت نہیں ہو گی سوائے
ان کمیونسٹ بھائیوں کے - میں

پہلے کہا کرتے تھے کہ تم مسلمان
پہلے ہو یا ہندوستانی - یہ ایک
سوال تھا جو کسی طرح سے بھی
صحیح نہیں ٹھہرتا تھا کیونکہ ایک
مسلمان ہوتے ہوئے بھی ایک ہندوستانی
ہو سکتا ہے - لیکن میں مانتا ہوں
جیسا کہ میں نے کہا ہے کہ کوئی
مذہب ہو، کوئی ازم ہو، سوشلزم
ہو، کمیونزم ہو، گاندھی ازم ہو، یا
نہرو ازم ہو، وہ سب کے سب اس
لئے ہیں کہ دیس کا اور انسانیت
کا بہلا ہو - اس لئے میرا یقین ہے
کہ اگر اس کانگریس سرکار کو ہٹانا
ہے تو اس لئے نہ ہٹاؤ کہ ملک
کر جائے، کھول کر جائے - آپ نے
کہا کہ کھول کا چوتھے پلان میں
کوئی حصہ نہیں ہو گا - یہ دیکھ کی
بات ہے، کوہلڈن ناؤ کے لئے بھی یہ
دیکھ کی بات ہے، مسٹر شکر کے
لئے بھی یہ دیکھ کی بات ہے اور
محمّد کوپا کے لئے بھی یہ دیکھ کی
بات ہے کہ کھول کا کوئی حصہ نہ
ہو -

تو اس وقت میں شاستری جی
کی طرح ہوتا یا شاہ صاحب کی طرح
ہوتا تو میں یہاں نیشنل گورنمنٹ
بناتا، اس لئے بلاتا کہ آج دیس پر
کہیں زیادہ دیتی ہے - اگر آپ سمجھتے
ہیں کہ کمیونسٹوں کا پھار دیس سے
یادہ رشہا ہے یا چائدا سے ہے، اگر
آپ سمجھتے ہیں کہ کمیونسٹوں کا

[شری عبدالغنی]

پیار ہندوستان سے زیادہ اپنے کمونزم سے
ہے۔ اگر آپ سمجھتے ہیں کہ ہر ایک
کو گوانا چاہتے ہیں، یہ قیود کو پسی
کے واسطے کو بلد کرنا چاہتے ہیں، تو
اس کا طریقہ یہ نہیں ہے کہ آپ
خال گالی دیں اور اگر کبھی ضرورت
پڑے تو پھر ڈانگے صاحب کی تعریف
کریں اور اگر ضرورت پڑے تو کوپالین
صاحب کی بھی کریں۔

مسلم لیگ کا ساتھ دینی والی
بات کہی گئی اور کہا گیا کہ مسلم
لیگ کے دے گئے۔ ٹھیک ہے ابھی
مسلم لیگ اور پہلے کی مسلم لیگ
میں زمین آسمان کا فرق ہے۔ اس
مسلم لیگ نے کہا کہ ہمارے نہتے
یافتہ جواہر لال نہرو ہیں۔ اس
مسلم لیگ نے کہا کہ کشمیر کا مسئلہ
اٹوٹ ہے لیکن انہی وفاداری نے باوجود
انہی یقین دلانے کے باوجود آخری
نتیجہ یہ نکلا کہ کھدو کہ کھل میں
مسلم لیگ کے دن ختم ہو گئے۔ ان
کو تو میں مشورہ یہ دیتا ہوں جیسے
اور سب اقلیتوں کی بات کرتے ہیں۔
بلاوٹی چرچا کرتے ہیں، ویسے ہی وہ
بھی ایسا نام اقلیتوں لیگ رکھ لیں
جس میں کہ عیسائی ہوں، سکھ
ہوں، ہریجن ہوں، اچھوت ہوں، جس
میں کہ سب شامل ہو جائیں۔ ان کو
تو مہر یہ مشورہ ہے۔ لیکن ان سے
مہرا یہ کہنا ہے کہ خالی دکھاوے کی

بائیں آپ کہتے ہیں کیوں کہ وہاں جو
کام کرنے والے ہیں وہ مسلم لیگ سے
گٹھ جوڑ کر دے، وہ کوشش کر لیتے
کہ مسلم لیگ سے سمجھوتہ ہو
تاہم پھر سے کانگریس طاقت میں
آئے۔ اور یہی حال باقی جماعتوں کا
بھی ہو سکتا ہے۔

لیکن کیا ہم واقعی سیکولرزم
چاہتے ہیں۔ اگر ہم سیکولرزم چاہتے
ہیں تو کیا اس کا جواب کوئی دے
سکتا ہے جو کہ فرین الحق انصاری
صاحب نے فرمایا کہ سیکولرزم کے
حامیوں، روز کیہ میں کیا ہوا، کلکتہ
میں کیا ہوا، ٹاٹانگ، میں کیا ہوا اور
اس کے بعد جو پکچر دکھائی گئی ظلم
و مظلوم کی وہ صرف ہندوؤں کی دکھائی
گئی مسلمانوں کی نہیں دکھائی گئی۔
تو اس کا کوئی جواب دے سکتا ہے ؟
جب ضرورت پڑتی ہے اس وقت چاہے
رہیڈیویشن کا معاملہ ہو یا اور کوئی
ہو تو بھوپیش کہتا ہی بلال نے
ایسے پاکستان نے مشرقی پاکستان نے
ہندو بھائیوں کا ذکر کرتے ہیں لیکن
کبھی انہوں نے یہ نہیں سوچا کہ ان کے
ہاں ان کے اپنے چراغ کے تلے کتنی نالائقی
ہوئی۔ اس کا کیا علاج بھوپیش کہتا
صاحب نے کیا، اس کا کیا علاج ننڈا
صاحب نے کیا، اس کا کیا علاج شامتری
جی نے کیا۔ مگر کسی کو خالی گالی
دے دینا یہ کہہ کر کہ یہ مسلم لیگی ہے
تو بات کچھ بدلتی نہیں۔ کچھ لوگ

ہوں گے جن کے ذریعہ میں ملک کی
دشمنی ہو۔ کچھ چھوٹے ہوئے ایسے ہو
سکتے ہیں تو ہوں۔ ہر جماعت میں
چھوٹی ہوئی کالی بھڑیوں میں لیکن
اس وقت آپ کا سیکولرزم کہاں تھا۔

تو اگر آپ کیل کی بھلائی چاہتے
ہیں، اگر آپ دیش کو بچانا چاہتے
ہیں، تو میں آپ سے عرض کروں گا کہ
کانگریس میں جو ہوں ان کو بھی یہ
کہوں گا کہ آپ دسائے کو صاف کیجئے
اور وہ صفائی تھی ہو سکتی ہے جبکہ
آپ صرف اس پر نہ جائیں کہ شاستری
جی کو کب گولیا جائے یا شاستری جی
کو کب مضبوط کیا جائے، یہ خیال
چھوڑئے۔ اسی طرح سے اندیشہ سے
کہنا ہوں کہ اگر آپ یہ چاہتے ہوں کہ
یہ کانگریس سرکار جو اس وقت ملک
کی تباہی کا باعث ہے جس نے کرپشن
کو بلانا دی ہے وہ ٹوٹ جائے تو آپ کو
ایک میٹھم پروگرام پر آنا ہوگا۔ آپ
کی یہ جو چھوٹی چھوٹی مسجدیں
ہیں ملندہ ہیں، گورنروں کے ہوں جو
ان کے الگ الگ قیوہ ایڈز کی
عمارتیں ہوں ان کو بھی آپ کو ختم کرنا
ہوگا۔ انصاری صاحب نے یہ بات کہی
کہ ہمیں کسی طرح بھی کوئی قبول

نہیں ہوگا۔ ہم کسی کو بھی نہیں
نہیں کریں گے کسی سے بھی ہم
ملوں گے نہیں۔ ایسا کہنے سے اگر ان
کی یہ توقع ہے کہ اس میں انہیں
کامیابی ہو جائے گی۔ تو یہ خیال
ہے۔ جناب سب سے پہلے انسانیت
ہے اور اس کے بعد دیش ہے تو پھر
دیش کی بھلائی کے لئے کسی سے
بھی تعاون کرنا پڑے جو صحیح
معدوں میں دیش کو پیار کرتا ہے
چاہے اس کا نام کچھ بھی ہو۔ اس کے
ساتھ ملنا ہوگا۔ اور اگر آپ ملوں گے
تو یقیناً آپ کو کامیابی ہوگی۔ پھر
میرا یہ بھی کہنا ہے کہ اگر کانگریس
کے کرنے سے دیش گرتا ہو تو پھر آپ
سب کانگریس کو ہی مضبوط رکھیں
اس لئے کہ دیش نہ کرے کہوں کہ
کانگریس سے پہلے دیش ہے۔ دیش
سب سے بڑا ہے۔ اگر دیش کی انتہی
دیش کی برائی اس میں نظر آتی ہو
تو اپنے پروگرام چلاتے رہیں اور آپ خوش
رہیں۔ مسلمان بھلے سے جنت میں
جائیں گے اور ہندو بھلے سے ہی سورگ
میں جائیں گے یہ سوشلسٹ بھلے سے
ہی دیش کا ملک کا بھلا ہو جائے گا
تو انہیں باتوں میں لگے رہیں لیکن
اس سے کوئی بات بھلے والی نہیں ہے۔

[شہری عبدالغلی]

آپ ایک مہم پر وگرام پر اتفاق کریں
اور تب اس کام کو اپنے ہاں میں
لیں ورنہ نہ شاستری جی دکھائی دیں
گئے نہ نلدا جی دکھائی دیں گے ملک
میں ایک انقلاب آنے کا اور وہ ایک
کانگریسی نہیں، دو کانگریسی نہیں،
ایک کمیونسٹ نہیں، دو کمیونسٹ
نہیں، ایک سوشلسٹ نہیں، دو
سوشلسٹ نہیں، بلکہ سب کو بہا لے
جائے گا۔ نہ جائے اس کے نہ کیا ہوگا۔
اس دیش میں کون بر سر اقتدار ہیں
گئے ان کا کیا ازم ہوگا ان کا کیا رویہ
ہوگا ان کا کیا نام ہوگا؟ کوئی نہیں
جاننا۔ وہ ایک کسان ہوگا ایک
مزدور ہوگا اس کی ہی جہت ہوگی
اور یہ سب لوگ جو وہیں سب ملے
دیکھنے دے جائیں گے۔

†[श्री अब्दुल गनी (पंजाब) मंडम डिप्टी
चेयरमैन, मुझे शर्मिन्दगी है कि अपोजीशन ने
कांग्रेस सरकार को गिराने के बाद अपनी सरकार
नहीं बनायी। इसका कारण सिर्फ एक है, कि
दुनिया में मजाहब और इज्म वह तो आए थे
इसलिए एक इन्सान की भलाई हो, देश की
भलाई हो, लेकिन बदकिस्मती में इन इज्मों
को, इन रिलीजनों को, इस तरह से बना लिया
गया कि सिवाय एक रिलीजन के कोई रिलीजन
ऐसा है ही नहीं जो इन्सान की भलाई कर सके,
या देश की भलाई कर सके। या जन्नत या स्वर्ग
का वह मालिक बन सके। आखिर यह जितने

इज्म है, सोशल इज्म हो, एस० एस० पी०
हो, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी हो, या कोई भी पार्टी हो,
वो दावा तो यही करते हैं कि हम देश की भलाई
चाहते हैं, तो फिर यह दिन देखने क्यों
नमीब हुए कि केरल में कांग्रेस की अकसरियत
के बावजूद वहा राष्ट्रपति का रूल लागू करना
पडा। जहा मैं शर्मिन्दा हूँ वहा मेरा यकीन है
कि कांग्रेस वाले भाई भी अगर अपने गिरेबान में
मह डाले चाहे वो शाह साहिब हो, या कोई
और हो, तो उन को भी जरूर अपनी नदामत का
एहसास होगा।

आखिर किस्सा क्या था, मंडम किस्सा
इतना था कि केरल में एक चीफ मिनिस्टर
जिस के खिलाफ कई तरह के इल्जामात थे—
वो गलत भी हो सकते हैं, मुझे इस से बहम नहीं
—उन के अपने साथी यहा आए और उन्होंने
आ कर कहा कि इसकी इन्क्वायरी हो। पंडित
जी ने यह फरमाया कि मैंने देख लिया कि इस
में कोई प्राइमार्फसी केस नहीं है। बिल्कुल
यह वही था जो कि पंजाब में हुआ। कुछ
कांग्रेसी भाई इसलिए कांग्रेस को छोड़कर नहीं
चले गए कि उनको कांग्रेस के मकासद से या
कांग्रेस के उसूलो मेया कांग्रेस की मरगर्मीयां में
कोई आपस में इखिलाफ न था, बल्कि वह ईमान-
दारी से यह महसूस करते थे कि पंजाब के चीफ
मिनिस्टर को, कांग्रेस के खुदाबन्द नाजायज
तौर पर पनाह दे रहे हैं और वह डिमिडेट कह-
लाए लेकिन ज्यूही मि० एस०, आर० दास का
फैसला आया उन कांग्रेसियों ने जलील होकर भी
मिन्नत से कांग्रेस में शरीक होना मजूर किया।
यह केरल के भाइयों को शिकायत थी कि
शकर साहिब कांग्रेस के बड़े पद के काबिल नहीं,
वो चीफ मिनिस्टर के पद के काबिल नहीं,
लेकिन यहा इस बात को कांग्रेस ने कबूल किया
कि वहा डेमोक्रेसी खत्म हो, इस बात को कबूल
किया कि उनकी जिल्लत हो, लेकिन इस बात
को कबूल नहीं किया कि वो 15 भाई जो उनके
साथी थे लेकिन वो शायद शास्त्री जी का हुक्म
न मानने वाले हो, तो एक ऐसा रिलीजन कि
जिसने दुनिया में खुदा को मानने वालो को

और न मानने वालों को हिन्दू कहा और प्रेम का सबक दिया, बतों की पूजा करने वालों और बतों का खंडन करने वालों, दोनों को प्रेम किया, और कोई झगडा नहीं किया, आज वह कांग्रेस जो गांधी जी की कांग्रेस कहलाती थी उसकी हालत यह हो गयी है कि शक रहना चाहिए क्योंकि वह शास्त्री जी का बन्दा है या वह नन्दा जी का बन्दा है या वह किसी और का बन्दा है और इन १५ भाईयों की बात नहीं मुनी गयी, तो कांग्रेस क्यों मुजरिम नहीं है ? मुझे शर्म है कि हम मिनीमम प्रोग्राम पर इति-फाक न कर सके । ए काश, कि केरल में भी कोई चोंधरी देवीलाल होता, ए काश, कि केरल में आचार्य कृपालानी की रूह काम करती और सब मिलकर यह सोचते कि हम कम से कम इस प्रोग्राम पर केरल की खिदमत कर सकते हैं । यह मैं मानता हूँ लेकिन कांग्रेस बचायी जाय तो वह बचेगी नहीं । वह क्यों नहीं बचेगी इसलिए कि ऋष्ट आदमियों के खिलाफ उन के अन्दर से कई भाई हैं और मेरा दावा है कि आज भी अगर पार्लियामेंट में दोनों हाऊसों में अपोजीशन और इन बेचा पर निगाह की जाय, अपोजीशन के लीडरों और जो मिनिस्टर्स हैं उन पर निगाह की जाय, तो अपोजीशन में ज्यादा वो लोग हैं जिन्होंने इन मिनिस्टर्स से और इन बेचों पर बैठने वालों से कही ज्यादा देश के लिए कुरबानी दी है और जिन्होंने गांधी जी का उन से कही ज्यादा साथ दिया है लेकिन उन में क्या हुआ ? उन में से एक गद्दी से प्रेम जो है, जो लालच उन में पैदा हो गया है, उसने उसको परेशान कर रखा है कि किस गुप का और किस गुट का आदम है । मुझे सदमा है इस बात का कि देश का क्या होने जा रहा है, क्योंकि मेटर हो या कोई स्टेट हो, वहाँ कांग्रेस के अन्दर जो माजिसे चल रही है वह मुल्क को कहा ले जाएगी में नहीं जानता लेकिन मेरा यकीन है कि कांग्रेस अगली बार ताकत में आने वाली नहीं है । लेकिन क्या केरल की तारीख फिर से अपोजीशन दोहराएगी ? इसका मुझे डर है कि अपोजीशन वाले जीत कर हार न जाए ।

इसलिये जहाँ मैं कांग्रेस वाले भाईया से कहता हूँ कि इसको मोचिये वहाँ दूसरों से भी यही कहता हूँ । आप कहते हैं कि इस पर कांग्रेस को बधाई दूँ कि उन्होंने बिल्कुल सही कदम उठाया कि उन्होंने राष्ट्रपति रूल लागू किया, नहीं यह बिल्कुल गलत है । अगर अपने १५ भाईयों को गजी नहीं कर पाते थे तो कम से कम उनको ताकत ही दे देते । उनसे कह देते कि तुम ही अपनी तरफ से काम चलाओ । यह कोई गद्दी की बात तो नहीं थी, मक्सद यह था कि केरल की खिदमत हो, तो अपोजीशन के भाईयों में भी यही कहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस सरकार तो निकम्मी हो चुकी है न, खोखली हो चुकी है, चाहें शाह साहिब कितने ही जोंग में कहें, चाहें गुजराल साहेब कितने ही जोंग में कहें, यह इमारत तो कायम रहने वाली नहीं है, लेकिन कहीं ऐसा न हो कि इसके गिरने में देश गिर जाए आज यह तो मानना चाहिये कि कांग्रेस सरकार के गिराने में अगर देश गिर जाए तो देश की यह कोई खिदमत नहीं हांगी सिवाय उन कम्युनिस्ट भाईयों के । हमें पहले कहा करते थे कि तुम मुसलमान पहले हो या हिन्दुस्तानी, यह एक सवाल था जो किसी तरह से भी सही नहीं ठहरता था क्योंकि एक मुसलमान होते हुए भी एक हिन्दुस्तानी हो सकता है । लेकिन मैं मानता हूँ जैसा कि मैंने कहा है कि कोई मजहब हो, कोई इज्म हो, सोशलिज्म हो, कम्युनिज्म हो, गांधीइज्म हो, या नेहरूइज्म हो, वह सब के सब इसलिये हैं कि देश का और इन्सानियत का भला हो । इसलिये मेरा यकीन है कि अगर इस कांग्रेस सरकार को हटाना है तो इसलिये न हटाओ कि मुल्क गिर जाये, केरल गिर जाये । आपने कहा कि केरल चौथे प्लान में कोई हिस्सा नहीं हागा । यह दुःख की बात है । गोविन्द नायर के लिए भी यह दुःख की बात है, मि० शंकर के लिए भी वह दुःख की बात है

[श्री अब्दुल गनी]

और मुहम्मद कोया के लिए भी यह दुख की बात है कि केरल का कोई हिस्सा न हा ।

ना इम वक्त मैं शास्त्रीजो की तरह होता, या शाह साहिब की तरह हाता, तो मैं यहा नेशनल गवर्नमेंट बनाता, इसलिय बनाता कि आज देश पर कहीं ज्यादा विपत्ति है । अगर आप समझते हैं कि कम्मुनिस्टों का प्यार देश से ज्यादा रणया से है या चाइना से है, अगर आप समझते हैं कि कम्मुनिस्टों का प्यार हिन्दुस्तान से ज्यादा अपने कम्मुनिज्म से है, अगर आप समझते हैं कि यह हर एक को गिराना चाहते हैं, यह डमोक्रसी के रास्ते का बन्द करना चाहते हैं, तो इसका तरीका यह नहीं है कि आप खाली गाली दें और अगर भी जरूरत पड़े तो फिर डागे साहिब की तारीफ करे और अगर जरूरत पड़े तो गोपालन साहिब की भी करे ।

८. -

मुस्लिम लीग का साथ देने वाली बात कही गई और कहा गया कि मुस्लिम लीग के दिन गये । ठीक है अब की मुस्लिम लीग और पहले की मुस्लिम लीग में जमीन आसमान का फर्क है । इस मुस्लिम लीग ने कहा कि हमारे नेता प० जवाहरलाल नेहरू हैं, इस मुस्लिम लीग ने कहा कि काश्मीर का रिश्ता अटूट है, लेकिन इतनी बफादारी के बावजूद, इतना यकीन दिलाने के बावजूद आखिर नतीजा यह निकला कि कह दो कि केरल में मुस्लिम लीग के दिन खत्म हो गए । उनको तो मैं मशविरा यह देता हूँ कि जैसे और सब अकलीयतों की बात करते हैं, बनावटी चर्चा करते हैं, वैसे ही वह भी अपना नाम अकलीयतों लीग रख ले जिसमें कि ईसाई हो, मिछ हो, हरीजन हो अछूत हो, जिसमें कि सब शामिल हो जाए । उनको तो मेरा यह मशविरा है । लेकिन उनमें मेरा यह कहना है कि खाली

दिखावे की बातें आप कहते हैं क्योंकि वहा जो काम करने वाले हैं वह मुस्लिम लीग से गठजोड़ करेंगे, वह कोशिश करेंगे कि मुस्लिम लीग से समझौता हो, ताकि फिर से कांग्रेस ताकत में आए । और यही हाल बाकी जमायतों का भी हो सकता है ।

लेकिन क्या हम बाकसी मैकडूल्डरडज्म चाहते हैं । अगर हम मैकडूल्डरडज्म चाहते हैं तो क्या उनका जवाब कोई दे सकता है जोकि फरोदुल हक अन्वारी साहिब ने फरमाया कि मैकडूल्डरडज्म के हमियों का राडकेला से क्या हुआ, बलकन से क्या हुआ, टाटानगर में क्या हुआ और उसके बाद जा फिक्कर दिखाई गयी जुलम, मजालम की बातें मिर्फ हिंदुओं का दिख गयी, मुसलमानों की नहीं दिखाई गयी, तो उसका कोई जवाब दे सकता है ? जब जरूरत पड़ती है उस वक़्त चाइ रिड्रैक्लेशन का मामला हो, या और कोई हो, तो भूपेश गुप्ता भा बगान के ईस्ट, पाकिस्तान के, मशरिफी पाकिस्तान के हिन्दू भाईयों का जिक्र करते हैं, लेकिन कभी उन्होंने यह नहीं साचा कि उनके यहा, उनके अपने चरण के तले, कितनी नालायकी हुई । इसका क्या इलाज भूपेश गुप्ता साहिब ने किया, इसका क्या इलाज नन्दा साहिब ने किया, इसका क्या इलाज शास्त्री जी ने किया, अगर किसी को खाली गाली दे देना पड़े कह कर कि मुस्लिम लीगी है तो यान कुछ बनता नहीं । कुछ लोग होंगे जिनके दिमाग में मुल्क का दुश्मनी हो, कुछ छिपे हुए ऐसे हो सकते हैं ना हो । हर जमायत में छिपी हुई काला भेड़ है लेकिन उस वक़्त आपका मैकडूल्डरडज्म क्या था ?

तो आप अगर केरल की भलाई चाहते हैं, अगर आप देश का बचाना चाहते हैं, तो मैं आपसे यंत्र करूंगा कि कांग्रेस में जा । उनका भी यही कहूंगा कि अपने दिमाग को साफ कीजिए और बल सफाई नभी हो सकती है जबकि आप इस पर न जाए कि शास्त्री जी का कुछ गिराया जाए या शास्त्री जी को कुछ

मजबूत किया जाए, यह खयाल छोड़िए। इसी तरह से अपराजासन में कहना है कि अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि यह कांग्रेस सरकार जा इस वक्ता मुल्क की तबाही का वाइस है, जिस ने करपजन को पनाह दी है, वह डूट जाए तो आपकी एक मिनिमम प्रोग्राम पर आना होगा। आपके यह जो छोटी छोटी मस्जिद है, मन्दिर है, गुरुद्वारे है, जो उनकी अलग-अलग डेढ़ डेढ़ ईंट की इमारतें हैं, उनको भी आपको खत्म करना होगा। अंसारी साहब ने यह बात कह कि हमें किसी तरह भी कोई कुत्ता नहीं हंसा। हम किसी को भी टव नहा करेंगे, किसी से भी हम मिलेंगे नहीं। ऐसा कहने से अगर उनकी यह तबक्का है कि उसमें उन्हें कामयाबी हो जायेगी तो यह खयाल ही खयाल है। जनाब, सबसे पहले इन्पानिशन है और उसी बाद देश है। तो फिर देश की भलाई के लिए किसी से भी तयार बनना पड़े, जो सही मतों से देश को प्यार करना है वह उसका नाम कुछ भी हो, उसके साथ मिलना होगा। प्रोग्राम अगर आप मिलेंगे तो यकीनन आपको कामयाबी होगी। फिर मेरा यह भी कहना है कि अगर कांग्रेस के गिने से देश गिरता हो तो फिर आप सब कांग्रेस को ही मजबूत रखें इसलिए कि देश न गिने क्यों कि कांग्रेस से पहले देश है। देश सबसे बड़ा है। अगर देश की उन्नति, देश की तरक्की, इन में नजर आती हो तो अपने प्रोग्राम चनाते रहे और आप खुश रहे, ममलमान बनने से जन्नत में जाएंगे और हिन्दू बनने से भी स्वर्ग में जाएंगे या सोशलिस्ट बनने से ही देश का मुल्क का, भला हो जायगा, तो उन्हीं बातों में लगे रहे लेकिन इसमें कोई बात बनने वाली नहीं है। आप एक मिनिमम प्रोग्राम पर इतिफाक करें और तब इस काम को अपने हाथ में ले लें। जनाब न शास्त्री जी दिखाई देंगे और न नन्दाजी दिखाई देंगे, मुल्क में एक इन्कलाब आएगा और वह एक कांग्रेसी नहीं, दो कांग्रेसी नहीं, एक कम्युनिस्ट नहीं, दो कम्युनिस्ट नहीं, एक सोशलिस्ट नहीं, दो सोशलिस्ट नहीं, बल्कि सबको बढ़ा ले जाएगा।

ना जाने इसके बाद क्या होगा। इस देश में कोन बरपरे इन्तदार होंगे, उनका क्या अजाम होगा, उनका क्या गिलाजन होगा, उनका क्या नाम होगा, कोई नहीं जानता। वह एक किसान होगा, एक मजदूर होगा, उसकी ही जीत होगी और यह सब लोग जो है सब मुह देखते रह जाएंगे।]

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, this debate is a melancholy occasion because for the third time after independence circumstances have forced the Government to enforce Proclamation in that State. Unfortunately in Kerala, since independence, eight Ministries have been in office. Six of them were Congress, one was PSP and one was the Communist Ministry. I have had occasion of going round Kerala during the time of the regime of the Communist Ministry and I have, therefore, some recent acquaintance with the problems of that State. It is not correct to say, as my hon. friend, Mr. K. K. Shah, did, that the Opposition Parties have been responsible for the promotion of communalism. The Congress Party, as much as any other Party, has been responsible for fomenting communal forces in Kerala and it is well known that in the Congress organisation itself the locations of power are on the basis of communalism. I do not want to go into the matter in great detail. It will provoke controversy. It is because communalism is inherent in a very acute form in Kerala that the present situation has arisen, which has forced the Government to enforce Proclamation in the State. I would like to say here that one of the factors, which have led to ministerial instability in Kerala, is the encouragement given overtly by people in Delhi and by the Congress organisation to the so-called liberation movement which threw the Communist Party out of power. I had occasion to see the work of the Communist Ministry and I felt that even though there might have been excesses of

[Shri A. D. Mani]

power and even though the Communist Party might have been trying to entrench itself in various places in the State by the use of the administrative machinery, the Communist Government did tolerably well and they should have been allowed to function for their whole term of office. If that had been done, the present situation would not have arisen. Those who released the forces of disruption have not been able to control the situation today. One of the reasons why the fifteen dissidents left the party was the fact that they knew very well that if they weakened the support for the Ministry, the Ministry would have to resign on a vote of no-confidence and Presidential rule would have to be enforced. Madam, I would also like to say that this Kerala episode which has led to Presidential rule underlines the necessity of Government having a prompt investigation machinery which will go into the question of corruption. I tried to ask some of my friends to let me have the so-called charge-sheet against Mr. Sanker, but unfortunately nobody has given me a charge-sheet. It has not been formulated in the form in which friends in Orissa have done their charges against Mr. Mitra's Ministry. They say that the cases of corruption are there, that there are various allegations, but they have not been formulated into a charge-sheet. I wish that in future, whenever such charges are made, the Government of India should try to evolve a machinery which will go into the complaints. Some years ago, Sir B. N. Rau had suggested the formation of a Privy Council which would advise the President in cases of this character. We need not call it a Privy Council, but a Council which would advise the Government. A council consisting of retired High Court Judges might be formed which might periodically advise Government in regard to cases of corruption, and whenever cases of corruption are *prima facie* proved, then there should be a machinery for investigation. If that had been done by the Congress High Command, pro-

bably the situation would not have arisen which forced the Sanker Government to resign on a vote of no-confidence.

Madam, I would like to say further that there was a good deal of criticism of the Muslim League. The Muslim League is a party which stands for the protection of the minorities in Kerala. I personally do not approve of communal parties, but if today the situation in Kerala is such that communal parties are tolerated by the electorate, there is no remedy open excepting to concentrate on economic issues. The Communist Ministry concentrated on economic issues and for the first time Kerala was marching forward in its economic programmes. That was arrested by the so-called liberation movement which led to the dismissal of the Communist Ministry and the subsequent imposition of Presidential rule in Kerala.

Madam, I would like to say this that in future if we expect communalism to be rooted out of Kerala, the Congress must set an example. I would like the Congress organisation to set up members of the minority communities in predominantly Hindu areas and try to fight the election. That will be the test of the professions of the Congress to root out communalism in Kerala. Unless that is done, it is not possible for the Congress to expect that the opposition parties will set an example. Each one of them is very much involved in this communalism that has disfigured public life in Kerala.

I might also mention here that the failure of ministerial government which is revealed by eight Ministries is due to the fact that linguistic reorganisation has not solved any problems. If in 1956 the choice had been left to the representatives of Malabar, so-called Malabar which was in Madras State, they would have opted to stay in Madras State. A linguistic

State was formed and it was expected that this would solve the problem, but the fact that a linguistic State has been formed has not led to ministerial stability in Kerala. Perhaps if the representatives of the various parties concentrate on economic issues, it may be possible to find out a new orientation to the politics in that State. I do not agree with my hon. friend, Mr. K. K. Shah, when he referred to Kerala as a problem State. Kerala is certainly not a problem State. It has got an intellectual potential which can be utilised for the benefit of this country. It is because politicians have been so busy trying to carve out a position for themselves and manoeuvre themselves into positions of power using every community for their advantage that this situation has arisen when people start calling Kerala a problem State.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The Congress Party is the problem there.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would not like to say that the Congress is responsible for the situation in Kerala.

(Interruption)

AN. HON. MEMBER: He preaches for every one.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am one of those who went round, met representatives of all parties including Congressmen and talked to them about the situation. Perhaps it is correct to say that the Congress Party in power in India should have set an example. If it is possible for the Congress to evolve an economic programme and put it before the electorate and not think in terms of coalition with parties just for continuing in power, there may be a bright future for the State of Kerala.

Then there was a reference made by my hon. friend, Mr. Ansari, to the appointment of Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai as Governor of Punjab. If Mr. Thanu Pillai had been a Government servant and if he had accepted this job, he would have been accused of accepting illegal gratification.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: I said that the method adopted by my hon. friend was wrong. He should have approached the P.S.P., consulted them, discussed the matter with them, and if they agreed, then I would have had no objection.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am supporting you. I am only saying that if Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai as a Government servant had been offered the job, he and the person who offered it would have been accused of bribery and would have been forced to face an enquiry and a charge-sheet under the Anti-corruption Act. The Congress should have set better example in regard to the ethics that it follows.

AN. HON. MEMBER: It was a clever thing.

SHRI A. D. MANI: But we do not expect this kind of cleverness from the Party. (Interruption) I agree with my hon. friend that election promises were broken. These things led to the degeneration of the standards of politics, and it is expected that whatever might happen in the future, the standards of politics which are accepted universally as necessary for the proper functioning of the parties would be observed by the Congress Party and that Kerala might have the good fortune of seeing a stable Ministry which will give its attention to the economic progress of the State. The economic progress of the State has suffered a reverse on account of the inability of some of the politicians in power to give their sustained attention to the Five Year Plans which were placed before the State Government for approval.

I support the motion which has been moved by the hon. Minister. I see there is no other way excepting to approve of the Proclamation issued by the President.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am happy that almost all the Members who took part in this discussion have fully supported my motion and they have appreciated

[Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi]

the circumstances in which the President had to assume to himself the powers to take over the administration of the State. Therefore, so far as approval of the motion is concerned, I do not think I have much to say. But several Members have discussed a number of subjects and I think I should reply to some of the observations made by the hon. Members here.

I am grateful to some of the Members, specially Shri Gujral and Shri Shah, for clarifying certain points raised by the Members of the 4 P.M. opposition. It is true that we must take lessons from the past but it is also true that everybody wants to advise others to take lessons but nobody likes to take lessons himself. It is human nature to criticise others, to bring out the faults of others and to see faults in others, rather than to have self-introspection. We have been criticised for a number of things, good, bad and indifferent. In the opening speech I did not touch these subjects because I did not want to rake up unnecessarily old controversies. Shri Ansariji, however, blamed me for not looking to the past, for not looking to the present, and for not taking lessons from the past for the future. It was not from that end in view that I did not refer to the past, it was not that we did not want to learn from experience, it was not with that object in view that I did not refer to the old instances. While we are always prepared to learn by experience—and we have done that a number of times—I do not want to bring in unnecessary controversies. But on questions like this, especially my friend, Shri Govindan Nair, started with attacks on all and sundry. He began by attacking Shri Kamaraj, attacking Shri Dhebar . . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I did not attack Shri Kamaraj.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: . . . attacking the Congress organisation for their acts of omission and commis-

sion. It is but natural I do not find fault with him because when you feel that something which you want is not being done, that something which you desire is not being achieved and when you feel that somebody comes in your way, it is but natural that emotions rise high and when emotions rise high, arguments become weak and when arguments become weak, it gives expression to anger and disappointment. So, I do not find fault with him. It is natural that he should say that it was Shri Dhebar who went there and did all this and that he would now reap the fruits.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: He reaps.

SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI: Now, it is natural also that one reaps the fruits of what he has sown. There is nothing unnatural in it. The only thing is that we have to judge whether the seeds that were sown were good or bad and that could only be judged from the fruits that we get. Now, let us see what was sown and what was reaped, what will be sown and what will be reaped. These are the lessons which each one of us should learn. I on my part and the Congress are prepared to take the lessons. I am not a man with a rigid outlook which would not change but if we find from experience that there was nothing wrong in what we did, there is nothing for us to repent. If we think that we have done something wrong, not only shall we repent but we will redeem ourselves and correct ourselves. The President issued the Proclamation when the political situation there was such as no single party—or even a united party under one single leader—was in a position to form the Government, although the Congress was in a much bigger majority than any other single individual party. And we who are wedded to democracy, we who want that we should work within the framework of the Constitution, we who want to abide by the provisions of the Constitution, we who want that even at the cost of being misunderstood and

even being disgraced to an extent, would like to follow that path which is righteous and which is correct. It was therefore that the Governor's Report was taken into consideration by the Government here and the Proclamation was issued. When the no-confidence motion was brought forward in Kerala, all the opposition parties combined together. They are all parties with different ideologies—I think they also would agree—the Communists, the PSP, the Muslim League, all have different political ideologies. They have never been one for any good object and I do not think they will any day be able to unite together and if they united together, they will all be minus. But today they are all bracketed together. When the bracket is gone, they will all be gone. One plus one would be two but one minus one would never be two, it will come to zero. It is always so for all negatives. Negatives may combine but the combination of negative attitudes would never lead to any positive result; it will have the effect of destroying a good thing; it will not have the effect of reconstructing anything, there cannot be any reconstruction. Therefore it is that if we have to join together, we have to join for a good cause, we have to join for a constructive cause, we have to join for a work which is in the interests of humanity, a work which is in the interests of the people of the State, people of the country. Now, here unfortunately there was a combination and that combination resulted in what we see there today. That also is natural. Now, we are asked to learn lessons. What are the lessons? The lessons to be learnt are preached by the Members from the opposition side. But before they preach, we ourselves will do it, we do not wait for anybody to teach the lessons. But if all of us have to learn any lesson, it is this that we believe that there should be an opposition, we believe that there should be a strong opposition, we believe that there should be a healthy opposition. Today what is the position? Fifty are on one side. All others combined make seventy. Each one is

matched by one-fourth of the Congress Party Members there in the Legislature—50, 15, 19, 9, 15, 11, 5, 1, all that. Now, if there had been one strong opposition or if two or three different parties with a constructive attitude, with the same ideology, had combined together and been able to form a government and administer the State in the interests of the people, for the benefit of the people, for the progress and development of the country, well, we would have welcomed it, everybody would have welcomed it. But it was not so. Now, therefore, what is the lesson to be learnt? The first lesson to be learnt is build up, if you can, a strong Opposition, build up, if you can, a healthy Opposition, build up a party which can succeed the present party. But I do not think that there is any chance in far, far future. And then what will happen? If there are five Members here, ten Members there and fifteen there, the result will be that no individual party will be able to form the government. (*Interruption by Shri M. N. Govindan Nair.*) I am learning the lesson. From what has happened it had been possible for them to join and form a united party and a Government which would be stable. But it has not been so. Then what is to be done? What is to be done is this. It is for the people of Kerala to find out what is good for them, what is best for them. The people of Kerala are educated; they are advanced; they are literate, and they could learn by experience as to what should be done. I do not want to say much even at this stage as I did not do it in the beginning as to why there was that upsurge or the liberation movement, as Shri Nair said. The people felt that they were not happy. There were various incidents which I would not like to narrate. They joined together. Ultimately we saw what happened. Even now if the people join together, if they all combine together, they could have a stable government. Rather it should be their effort to see that a stable government is established. So far as I can see, as in the rest of the country, there cannot be any other

[Shri Jaisukhlal Hathi.]

party today except the Congress Party which can form a government there. If in future things change, well, it will be most welcome. Otherwise it is in the interest of everybody—I do not talk of power because the congress has never learnt to rule for the Party; it has always ruled for the people, for the benefit of the people—to have Congress Party in power. If it were not so, then the party in power would have done anything to get more seats, to get that it wants as it has done in other things. (Interruptions) There may be instances, as Shri Abdul Ghani said, of corruption in the Congress. If there is corruption, if there are differences of opinion, we admit them and as soon as we find some symptoms of weakness we always try to remedy them. The Congress has that vitality, the Congress has that strength, the Congress has that vigour that as soon as those symptoms are checked, it will become strong and gain strength from day to day. It is not that we are complacent. If we know, we admit our weakness. It is always good to admit one's weakness and try to remedy and get rid of it. That we have been doing either at the organisational level or at the political level. It is, therefore, that the moment we find that there is something, we try to rectify the wrong. And if any weakness has been found out and remedied, it is because of self-introspection that the Congress does. But it is given to many others to exaggerate what little weakness they find in others and not to look to bigger things within themselves. We have never done that. Whatever weakness we ever felt we have always admitted and we are always prepared to admit it. It is not an easy thing. But ultimately what are we to do? As the hon. Member on this side said, during this period it would be the duty of the Government of India to see that the Fourth Plan that is being discussed should not suffer. It should be the duty of the Government that the officers that we send there should remain impartial. It should be the duty of these officers to treat Kerala as a State

where there are no representatives of the people at present, where there is no legislature, and therefore they must treat it with the utmost care and attention.

Madam, it shall always be the duty of the Centre to see that the Fourth Plan of Kerala that is being discussed does not suffer because of want of representatives at the helm of this thing. We would also take care to see that the problem of food, the question of industrial development, the question of power and irrigation projects are looked into properly.

So far as elections are concerned, I would also say that we would not wait for a day longer than is absolutely necessary. There shall be elections as early as possible and that they should be fair and free.

Madam, so far as officers are concerned, their complaint is that the Government could not find officers for Kerala. It is not a question of not being able to find them. But, as I said, it is now our duty and responsibility to see that we send the best officers to the State. We have already sent one and we shall be sending another. But that should be the best officer and an able administrator, a person who would not allow the people of Kerala to feel that Kerala is not being ruled by the elected representatives. Therefore, if there is any delay, it is not that we are not able to find any person. We could have sent any man. But that would not serve their purpose, nor would it serve the purpose of the State. It is, therefore, that we want to send officers who are not only able administrators but also people who would look to the interest of the people of Kerala, who would take to their heart that it is their not only official responsibility but a kind of moral responsibility to look to the interests of the people of Kerala. It is, therefore, that we are trying to send some of our best officers there. The one we have sent there has that reputation. The other we shall send soon.

I may, therefore Madam, only assure my friends from Kerala and also others that this is only a transitory period and that we shall try to see that the people of Kerala get back their elected representatives and their legislature through a fair and free election. It is for the people of Kerala to see that they use their discretion at the time of election in a way that they get a stable government and that this history is not repeated. Madam, I move

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 10th September, 1964, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Kerala"

The motion was adopted.

**THE KERALA STATE LEGISLATURE
(DELEGATION OF POWERS) BILL,
1964**

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS** **SHRI
JAISUKHLAL HATHI** Madam, I move

"That the Bill to confer on the President the power of the Legislature of the State of Kerala to make laws, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration"

Madam, this is a Bill which, according to the Proclamation, as has been just approved by the House, declares

"That the powers of the Legislature of the said State shall be exercisable by or under the authority of Parliament"

And under article 357 of the Constitution, the power of the Legislature of the State of Kerala to make laws, which has been declared by the Proclamation, to be exercisable by or under the authority of Parliament, is hereby conferred on the President

This is a Bill which is non-controversial in view of the fact that the House has already approved the Proclamation. This is a consequence which flows out of the Proclamation which has been approved by the House. Under clause (3) the power of the State Legislature to make laws has to be vested in the President. Clause 3(2) provides

"Before enacting any such Act, the President shall, whenever he considers it practicable to do so, consult a committee constituted for the purpose consisting of—

(a) thirty members of the House of the People nominated by the Speaker among whom shall be included all members who for the time being fill the seats allotted to the State of Kerala in that House; and

(b) fifteen members of the Council of States nominated by the Chairman among whom shall be included all members who for the time being fill the seats allotted to the State of Kerala in that House"

This is the position to enable the President to consult the Members of both the Houses of Parliament. The provision here also mentions that all the Members from Kerala, in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, will be included in this Committee. It is but fair that when there is no Legislature in Kerala and when Acts have to be passed by the Parliament, the Members representing that State in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha should be consulted and it is also proper that because they have now come into a bigger family, this consultation should not be restricted simply to the Members of the State but also there should be a broad-based committee so that Members from other States also may be consulted. It is with that object in view that the Committee is supposed to consist of 45 Members.